

Col

PROCEEDINGS

ARDEN HOUSE INSTITUTE ON ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS OF EXECUTIVES OF AGENCIES FOR THE BLIND

Edited by

H. Kenneth Fitzgerald, DSW

Held at

Arden House, Harriman, New York

May 1, 2, 3, 1961

SPONSORED BY:

NEW YORK STATE COMMISSION
FOR THE BLIND

AND

THE AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR
THE BLIND

WITH GRANTS FROM THE OFFICE
OF VOCATIONAL
REHABILITATION

AND

THE AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR
THE BLIND



**M.C. MIGEL LIBRARY
AMERICAN PRINTING
HOUSE FOR THE BLIND**

P R O C E E D I N G S

Arden House Institute on Administrative Problems
of Voluntary Agencies

Arden House, Harriman, New York

May 1, 2, 3, 1961

H. Kenneth Fitzgerald, DSW, Editor

HV1775

F

copy one

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	I
Foreward	II
Preface	III
Introduction	1
Program Development	4
Program Formulation	10
Executive Leadership	17
Personnel	32
Community Relations I	37
Community Relations II	49
The Challenge of Being An Administrator	54
Footnotes	59
Discussion Outline	60
List of Attendees	64

Foreword

Knowing that good administration constitutes one of the basic strengths of any agency program in serving blind persons, the American Foundation for the Blind and the New York State Commission for the Blind are pleased to present the Proceedings of the First Arden House Institute on Administrative Problems. The object of this Institute was to enable the executives of voluntary agencies in the State of New York to improve their executive performance. It is hoped that through this Institute, and others of its kind, administrators will develop a broadened concept of their role and responsibility, will find new ideas, and will be encouraged to renewed resourcefulness in fulfilling their roles.

The Foundation and the Commission wish to express their sincere thanks to the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for its support, guidance and participation in this first Institute on Administration for voluntary agency executives. It is a clear reflection of a growing understanding of the partnership public and voluntary agencies share in serving blind persons.

M. Anne McGuire, Director
New York State Commission for the Blind

M. Robert Barnett, Executive Director
American Foundation for the Blind, Inc.

Preface

- - - -

This publication makes available the Proceedings of the Institute on Administrative Problems of Executives of Voluntary Agencies for the Blind held at Arden House on May 1, 2 and 3, 1961.

The New York State Commission for the Blind and the American Foundation for the Blind in projecting this Institute, saw it as one way of helping executives of agencies serving the blind throughout New York State to become more aware of principles and practices of administration which they, in turn, could utilize in the day-to-day operations of their agencies. Planning for the Institute was developed by a staff committee representing both the Commission and the Foundation including: Mr. Herbert Brown, Dr. H. K. Fitzgerald, Mr. Oscar Friedensohn, Miss M. Anne McGuire, Miss Virginia McDonough, and Mr. Harold Roberts.

Institute leaders were Dean Wayne Vasey, Graduate School of Social Work, Rutgers University, and Dr. Marshall Dimock, Professor, and Chairman of the Department of Government and International Relations, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, New York University. Joint planning for the Institute by the Planning Committee and Institute Leaders was guided by the premise that administrators of social agencies carry some of the following responsibilities:

- 1) The quantity and quality of service offered by an agency are a chief concern of the administrator;
- 2) The administrative process encompasses every act, every technique and every consideration in the processes necessary to transform social policy into social services;
- 3) Coordination is an essential ingredient in efficient and effective administration, which in turn calls for a unity of purpose and a unity of action.
- 4) The major administrative functions of an agency include (a) policy making, (b) program development and control, (c) decision making (d) planning, standardization and evaluation, (e) leadership, supervision, (f) mobilization and maintenance of resources, (g) recording, accounting, (h) public relations.

Realizing that such a breadth of subject matter could not be included in three days of meeting, three specific areas of administration were focused on with the hope they would provide the basis for increased depth in this educational experience. These were (a) program development for client services, (b) integration of service programs within the agency,

(c) integration of service programs within the community. The format was designed to provide for the presentation of materials by the Institute leaders followed by group discussion.

The proceedings of this Institute were recorded. The material presented in this publication is a summarized version of both the presentations by the Institute Leaders and the discussions. In making the condensation, efforts were made to retain as much of the substance as possible with the avoidance of duplication, and at the same time to present the material in a compact, readable and useable document. In making these proceedings available, the American Foundation for the Blind hopes to share some of the Institute content with the growing number of persons in the field for the blind who are interested in improving the administration of their agencies.

H. Kenneth Fitzgerald, DSW, ACSW
Editor

Introduction

Dr. Marshall Dimock

Administrators, I should like to talk briefly about what we hope to accomplish during the three days of this Institute and then have my colleague, Mr. Vasey, talk about the subject for today. The reason that we thought it necessary to talk about the whole subject is that the essence of administration is relationships. "Relationships" sounds like a rather cold non-human term, but, actually, the essence of administration is the human factor. In recent years it has been emphasized much more than anything else.

We, therefore, want to talk about the relationship of today's subject to the following sessions in order that we may get ourselves oriented and so you will be able to participate. The hope that Mr. Vasey and I have is that when we leave here three days from now we will feel that this has been a down-to-earth, practical, and helpful Institute. Your outline was developed by your program committee and we're working from your outline. We think it's a good outline.

Today we are dealing with program development, which is another universal of administration, because the other things that enter into relationships revolve around the program. Tomorrow we're dealing with internal administration. For it, we use the word "integration." This word, "integration," is closely related to the word, "relationship," and the test of the ideal administrator is the degree to which he is able to integrate all of the factors in his personality, character, professional know-how, sensitivity, intelligence, and everything else, in order to become an ideal instrument to accomplish the social purpose to which he is dedicated.

The third day, the subject is Community Relations, Public Relations, Inter-agency Relationships, so that the three subjects are Program, Administration and Public Relations.

I want to say a little bit about how these three are justified in terms of the possible topics that might have been chosen for this three-day session, because I think that these three topics, if we go at it right, will make it possible to cover the whole area that we need to give attention to.

The purpose of this three-day session is to improve our executive performance and, by improving our executive performance, to improve the administrative performance of the agency with which we are connected. You may very properly ask whether this is not too high an ambition, especially for such a brief period of time. Actually, it has been discovered that administrative effectiveness is largely a matter of understanding what your role is in terms of all the relationships involved. Once you get a clear idea of what these factors are, what the relationships are, and what the role is, there is often a very remarkable improvement in terms of administrative performance. This is why, all over the world, executive development programs are taking place. I'd like to tell you about some in which I have taken part in such places as England, Turkey, and various other countries, but we don't have time for it. Everywhere executive development programs are in the air. Why? Well, one of the obvious reasons is that, with increased size of organizations, there is increased complexity. Therefore, there are more relationships to be concerned with. You don't all work in a large agency, and, therefore, this criterion may not apply. With the increase of knowledge there is another source of complexity because you may need to know more about the subject. I think it's been discovered that specialization, in, and of itself, does not necessarily produce efficiency. Specialization when accompanied by integration produces efficiency. Standing alone, it rarely does, except in a machine, and we are not dealing with machines. We're dealing with human beings. Therefore, there is another complex element that we need to understand. This factor which enters into administration is that our institutions, our free institutions, are very much under trial today. We need to tighten them up; we need to make them more effective all along the line in order to match the power of dictatorial regimes that we dislike. This means that every agency--literally every agency--needs to become more effective. We need to become aware of what we call the political economy outlook. We need to become aware of how our work contributes to the public welfare and the economic health of the country. We need to do things better. We need to do things better by voluntarily understanding relationships.

If we are not to have regimentation, and if we are not to be told what our role should be, then we should voluntarily analyze things and do it without being told. It means that--irrespective of whether you work in education as we two leaders do, or you work with the blind-- no matter what your field is, there needs to be an improvement in administrative performance in order that all of our institutions may be more effective. Therefore, this is one of the challenges that confronts us today.

The most important reason that executive development programs are taking place is that we need to do a better job of serving our clients. We Americans are very proud of the fact that we are good organizers and administrators, and, yet, there is always a great danger of complacency. We need to improve in order to make progress. Countries that do not have administrative skills never develop. This is true of most of the under-developed countries. We have administrative skills, but the challenge to us is that we need to improve these administrative skills. Hence, one of the things that we need to do is to analyze, as clearly as we can, what is involved in administration, in order that we may see how all of these things need to be integrated in terms of how we individually can improve.

The acid test of any executive development program is what it does to the individual in terms of giving him a philosophy of administration. There is a very close relationship between administration and mental health. Mental health is a matter of balance--psychic as well as chemical balance. Administration is a matter of balance. Improved administration is a matter of understanding all of the factors, the variables, which need to be integrated.

That brings me to the last point that I want to make, namely, why do we choose these three particular subjects. I think the best way to explain is that they give you a sort of check-list of what is involved in administration.

Program Development

Wayne Vasey

Although we refer to the subject of program development, we can express it in other ways. Perhaps an apt phrase would be the determination of the mission of the organization. We know that a program without direction will not lead to effective services. A mission, or the objective of the organization embodied in the mission, must not only be clear but clearly understood throughout the organization. To get at this subject, we might examine, for a moment, the point of how a program develops--how to initiate it. This is perhaps an over-simplification. First there has to be a problem. It must be a problem which is recognized by enough people and which has aroused enough concern to lead to an acknowledged need. But, that still isn't enough! There must be a value system in the community which in time leads to doing something about this problem. Without the value system, no action will be taken. For example, we know that we have a serious problem in education in this country--elementary, secondary, and higher education. However, we have value conflicts at this time which impede the development of federal action in the field of education to sustain state and local efforts. I mention this in the context of a different kind of program simply to illustrate the fact that the existence of a problem is not in itself enough to insure the development of a program to meet the problem.

When a program is developed and a value system has led to action--and I must say that there is nearly always some kind of value conflicts in the development of a program--we have a mandate for the program which may be embodied in law, if it is a public agency; in the charter of the organization; or in the established policy, written or unwritten, of the voluntary agency. I hold that a distinction between voluntary and public agencies in this regard should not be too sharply made. Voluntary agencies also operate under an organic policy which is generally a mandate to carry out a definite action or mission. We have a tendency to think of policy as a kind of organic governing purpose of the organization, e.g.: We have a foreign policy; we have a labor policy which fluctuates from time to time; we have a welfare policy in this country, we have a rehabilitation policy, in a very broad sense, all of which tend to govern our actions or help set our course for us. There is a tendency to think of policy in this way, i.e., that we have a law or a charter or some kind of mandate which establishes clearly the policy of the program, the objectives of the organization. Then we have to amplify the law by rules and regulations. These rules and regulations are an orderly way of insuring that there will be something done, a way to make certain that there will be an action outcome. Then we have decisions which are made clear within the framework of this policy. In other words, your agency carries out this policy which is set forth by written mandates and by rules and regulations.

Policy development is not that simple, and this is one thing that I want to make very clear at the outset. Policy, the mission, the objectives, are being established continually in the operation of the organization. Policy evolved through the mission of the organization undergoes many changes as a result of experience in the rendering of a service. It's a continually changing process. The daily decisions which are made at the agency have a stimulating effect on policy. I want to emphasize this changing character of the mission--this changing nature of policy. Such change can happen without a constitutional amendment.

The second thing I want to emphasize is that all such policy is subject to either a broad or a narrow interpretation. Habit and temperament of the people in the program, especially of leadership, play an important role. We can almost always use the policy as a basis for rendering a service, or we can use a policy as a restriction on the rendering of a service. I can give you examples from public welfare and fields closely related to yours which serve to illustrate the importance of how you look at the question, which in turn is determined by your temperament and habit.

I had a case supervisor when I was a public welfare director who could always ask a question in a way that was designed to evoke a negative response. For instance, about the time of the hotel cases in New York City, she came to me with a question somewhat as follows: "Is it our policy to maintain hotel cases?" "Oh, no," I explained, "that's not our policy - we'd get into lots of trouble!" Now the actual situation was this: The client was a woman with three children. All of them, including the woman, were too ornery for any landlord to keep any house or apartment for them. Finally they had to be put in the only hotel that would take them. This was the only domicile in the whole community that would accept them. Instead of looking for a temporary way to meet this problem until we could find a better solution the supervisor raised the question, "Is it our policy to maintain hotel cases?"

Another example which she brought to my attention went something like this: "Is it our policy to subsidize a business?" Is it our mission, in other words, to do this sort of thing? The actual situation was something like this:

The client owned a business. He had three children, one of whom was suffering from a terrible chronic illness which in turn called for expensive medical care. He could support his family with his business, but he couldn't raise the price of the medical care. He was asking for help with that one particular problem. Now instead of saying could we help this beleaguered father meet his responsibilities so he would not have to sell his business and deprive his family of a livelihood,

all the supervisor could see in the situation was the question: "Is it our policy to subsidize a business?" These are examples of the importance of how you look at a problem.

On a number of occasions I have said that there are people who always look at a policy as a barrier or a wall. Others look at it as an avenue opening the way to service. Now, the avenue can be too free and open, or it may have some lanes. I'm not advocating a ruthless disregard of any restraint on the activities of people who are working in an organization. I am suggesting that the mission of any kind of rehabilitation or health and welfare service generally is that of helping people. There is a danger always of examining this policy or mission too narrowly, as well as too broadly, without giving attention to any kind of restraint.

The third point I want to make is that there are many factors which influence policy, since as we noted earlier it is dynamic and changing. One is the changing nature of the clientele. When I say changing nature I'm referring to changes in relation to the community, to changes in how they live, to the problems they face, and to rehabilitation programs in relation to opportunities. A second factor which has a great effect on mission is "discovery." There are people who would have been considered helpless a generation or two ago. Now, by the grace of scientific medical discovery, and social intention, too, they are no longer helpless and incapable of self-maintenance and self-care.

A fourth point is the level of aspiration which society develops for the handicapped, and this is extremely important. I have a quotation from Miss Mary Switzer, Director of the Federal Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, on this point which relates to the way in which we regard the handicapped. She said: "If we have a narrow view of the place of handicapped people in the world of work; if we aim only at placing the handicapped in a few menial tasks; if we are more interested in disposing of the problem than we are in bringing the person to the highest and most productive place he can achieve, then we have missed the true, the great opportunity in rehabilitation. Disposing of the problem is not enough. The objective then becomes one of bringing the person to the highest and most productive place he can achieve." This is a level of aspiration; it is an expression of hope for the people in rehabilitation programs which should definitely be the keynote to all rehabilitation programs.

This is especially important, because I have very strong convictions that the way people are treated by the personnel in an agency and the way the programs are supported will depend upon the perception of the clientele. The real essence of approval of a program will rest upon the view that the public has of those who are being served. If they have no hope for them, there is not too much disposition to support a service or disposition for those directly connected with the service

to do much in the way of rehabilitation or active work with them. If we have a hopeful view, if we think that people can be helped, that there is a place for them, that there is opportunity for them, then our efforts are going to be much more enthusiastic and support is going to be much more effective and plentiful. So I say, begin with a strong emphasis on the fact that we must believe in the people who are being served, and we must believe in the possibility of their benefiting from the service, if our efforts are really to be successful.

Now we get to the question of developing specialized services. We decide that the clientele is hopeful. Other factors are present. Thus, out of our efforts we have evolved a specialized service. Mr. Alexander Handel of the American Foundation for the Blind has raised a question as to whether there is an actual danger of segregation of service, rather than specialization. Some say that there are instances in which we have segregation but not specialization. We have segregated the clientele but have not necessarily provided for specialized service. The difference between simple segregation of a clientele and the specialization of a service is an extremely important point. I call attention to Alexander Handel's article on this subject in The New Outlook for the Blind.⁽¹⁾

It is important that an organization periodically examine and, perhaps, even redefine its mission. In the survey report of the Buffalo Association for the Blind⁽²⁾ the role of the specialized agency is discussed. Role may be different from mission, but the role is related to the mission, and I think the mission is contained in this statement of "role." Under Findings and Recommendations, the role is described as to:

- A. Act as a repository for specialized knowledge;
- B. Assume a consultative role, and act as a resource for all other community agencies and groups interested in serving blind persons;
- C. Champion blind persons and act as a positive protagonist in community interpretation for the purpose of opening the doors of the general community services to blind persons;
- D. Initiate and participate in social action utilizing specialized knowledge gained through experience;
- E. Provide needed services not elsewhere available, in keeping with the best professional standards and competencies available. In some instances, this will involve pioneering in areas in which professional experience is limited.

This is a statement which has in it elements of a specialized role requiring the establishing of a specialized agency. This role must be continually and consciously examined and re-examined.

Now, I don't wish to get into Dr. Dimock's discussion of tomorrow, but it is hard to separate sharply and clearly the subject of administration into mutually exclusive categories. I do wish to call attention,

in connection with mission, to the fact that an agency can get along, maybe to its own satisfaction, without periodically examining its mission or changing it. There is a momentum which an agency can develop and an inertia which it can develop. It can be doing a job well. The question will always arise, however, whether it is the job it ought to be doing. This is the point I want to stress; you can do a job well, but is it the job that ought to have priority in the agency's program? Should this job represent its chief mission in the light of changing conditions, new discoveries, changing problems, and changing aspirations? A narrow kind of efficiency is not enough; efficiency, as Dr. Dimock uses it, encompasses a broader range of concern.

As we look at programs for the blind we are confronted with alternatives. Are these programs to be primarily concerned with helping people simply to become adjusted? Is our mission simply to help them to accept their handicap? Is it one of providing them with more comfort because we are a humane society? Is our mission merely one of providing a more comfortable life for people? Or, is the mission one of rehabilitation in a much broader sense? I hold that the key to this is to be found in Miss Mary Switzer's statement to the effect that the purpose is that of bringing the person to the most productive and highest level that he can achieve.

All programs in the health, welfare and rehabilitation fields have gone through certain evolutionary steps. I sincerely feel that we have made real progress and that this evolution is real. We start off with a sense of conscience--not just nominal, but rather we want to do something about the problem. Something is aroused; a sense of justice and of fair play are involved. And so we start off with a humane program. And then we discover help for people. Now we have a second dimension, which is one of rehabilitation, not just philanthropy, not just charity, but rehabilitation, restoration, and the acknowledgment that people have their place in society. Further, there is a recognition of the fact that that place should involve a job, because a job, in a sense, is a passport to a respectable place in society. A job has meaning and purpose to people. Of course, along with this goes treatment. Without treatment how can a person find a place? Education is also required. These are all a part of the rehabilitation process.

The third phase of the evolution is one of prevention, one of developing social action along the lines of prevention, not just to prevent the disability itself, which is using prevention in a public health sense, but also to prevent disabilities as a result of blindness. This means the establishing of, or creation of, a more favorable social and cultural climate. I contend that a specialized agency, which is distinguished from a segregated agency, has as its purpose, then, the responsibility to act as an agent in the development of a more favorable climate.

Such an outlook is one of the ingredients of a mission. Sometimes I've had moments of uneasiness about specialized services, even though I recognize their value and necessity. It goes back to the historic concern over a categorical approach in social welfare. Some believe in it for the very reason that it is the one way to get action. Yet we sometimes wonder if there isn't a danger of ghettoization of approach within specialized agencies. We have identified a clientele. We have identified it to the point that we have separated it into specialized agencies, which may have the effect of cutting off the clientele from other community services. We have called attention -- perhaps too sharply -- to these special needs. Would it be better to have the clientele served in non-specialized agencies?

Have you distorted your mission by fostering in a community an impression of a dependency factor in relation to particular groups? I think you could ask the same question with reference to the senior citizen around the development of agencies dealing with gerontological programs. You could ask this of agencies dealing with the juvenile delinquent. You could ask this question in many cases. On the other hand, would these particular client groups get lost in the large mass program which is multi-functional and multi-purpose? Do we need a specialized program with a particular sharp sense of mission to carry out this program -- to meet the needs of this particular clientele, to mobilize the specialized services which are required, to deploy skills in the way that will insure best results? These are all questions with which we are bound to be concerned.

Suppose we postulate the mission of agencies serving the blind as being not only to work for the provision of opportunity for blind people to take their place in a manner fully commensurate with their capabilities and to work for the improvement of opportunities for them but, also, to provide those supportive, restorative and rehabilitative services which are necessary to assist these people to make the most of their capacities. This is a pretty broad mission and an important one. I don't think it differs too much from other rehabilitative services, because an emotionally handicapped person or a person who has no visible physical problem can be just as disabled and require just as much in the way of treatment, restoration, education, rehabilitation, and provision of opportunities.

While we are noting the particular problems of a group, we want to be careful not to separate it too sharply, too completely from the problems that other people have, and focus too much on the problem rather than on the person. Our mission is still that of helping the person.

Program Formulation

Dr. Marshall Dimock

This evening, we have about an hour and a half to discuss the subject of the first day, program formulation. I want to start the discussion with a brief summarization of what Wayne Vasey said this afternoon and to make certain comments on the subject. The reason for doing this is that it will help to remind you of the general argument we made this afternoon -- and, also, possibly suggest certain critical comments that can be added to it. The second part of this, in the nature of critical comment, may also stimulate you to be critical of yourselves.

You will recall that during this three day session we are discussing three aspects of the problem of administration and how to become better executives. The first day is devoted to program formulation, tomorrow is devoted to executive leadership and internal administration; and the third day is concerned with the relationship between various programs in the community and the whole field of public relations. We touched upon the question of public relations this afternoon, and for that we have no apology because administration is an integration of many factors. It is impossible to discuss the subject of administration in vacuo. Therefore, if we make inter-connections between various aspects of administration now, this is an advantage rather than a disadvantage.

Wayne Vasey said this afternoon that the development of a program depends, first, upon the isolation or the designation, the analysis of the problem. The problem depends upon the acknowledged need. Whether we are able to determine what the problem is depends upon our value system. He didn't say this -- but if we were completely deficient with regard to a value system, there would be very few problems. To the extent that we do have values, more problems arise. He then said that after we have determined what the problem is and what the value system is, then we must have action. This is what is called a mandate for the program. It is organic and indigenous. As a result of a mandate we are able to develop policy. Policy is a generalized statement with regard to the proposed solution of the problem. Once we have policy, then, we must have rules and regulations, because rules and regulations are derived from the policy. And, once we have all of these things, then we are in a position to make decisions. A large part of executive action involves decision making. I shall comment upon this later, not disagreeing with him, but further elaborating on what he said. He then pointed out that policy is dynamic and changing; that one's mission undergoes a constant change; that the decisions one reaches stem very largely from certain factors such as habit and temperament. The policy may be either a barrier or an avenue.

One of the factors that is very important in terms of developing a program is the changing nature of the clientele. There is such a thing in administration as discovery. People who were helpless a generation ago, such as the blind, are not now. To a very considerable extent our success as administrators depends upon the level of aspiration, which again reverts back to our value system. Then, we enunciate the principle of social psychology, which is that people respond to the way that they are treated. Therefore, from the standpoint of being a successful executive we must believe in the people being served if we are to reach the optimum in terms of our possible effectiveness.

Dean Vasey, then, called attention to the fact that there is a tendency to develop specialized services which is inherent in our society. Because of it we ought to be aware of the segregation of clientele and, hence, the opposed dichotomy. This dichotomy constitutes the principal part of a later discussion, that we periodically must re-define and re-examine the services of our respective agencies, keeping always in mind the question - "Does it have a priority concern?" Efficiency is not enough, because efficiency may be very narrowly defined, whereas efficiency needs to be broadly defined in terms of human beings. We need to be aware of role. Here there are three possibilities. We can simply become adjusted, which will make us bureaucratic -- he didn't say this; these are my words -- we can be comfortable or can think in terms of administrative convenience; or we can do what I think he recommended, and that is the broader. Our objective can be to bring the person to the highest and most productive plane he can achieve. This ought to be our aim.

One of the things we ought to keep in mind in terms of program formulation is the balance between remedial action and prevention. Between these two, prevention ought to be emphasized. This means social action. The cultural climate ought to be such as to make it possible for people who are handicapped to achieve the goal which is the maximum utilization of their potentialities upon which depends their happiness. There is the possible danger that we will fall short of our goal because of the distortion of mission which is the result of what Dean Vasey called segregation -- which is a narrow myopic view. His conclusion with which I agree was that in terms of program formulation we ought to provide opportunity for individuals, and I think he meant this universally, but it applies particularly to the blind, commensurate with their abilities.

I now want to make a few critical comments upon this discussion. As you probably know, my principal role is to study the various trends in the field of management. Most of my studies are in the field of large scale management, industrial and governmental, rather than the field that you are interested in. Some of the most recent developments have revolved around this question of program formulation. Hence, I want to add, in terms of critical comments, certain things about these trends.

There is a very distinct tendency in the United States today -- and my belief is that this could be very injurious to the welfare of this country -- to make a dichotomy between policy and administration. My view is that policy ought to be a part of administration and not a separate entity. I want to call attention to the fact that there is a very distinct tendency to think in terms of a sharp demarcation between these two areas. Let me give you some illustrations;

The Jackson committee, which is studying the organization for decision making in the federal government, has said that the administrative solution to our problems of decision making, -- and they call attention to such things as the U-2 incident and various other unfortunate occurrences of recent years -- is complicated because of the fact that we rely upon administration for decision making. They say we ought to think in terms of a separate group of people who make policies and another group of people who carry out these policies. They have suggested that possibly we ought to have in the State Department a group of officials who would be a "think" group, who ought to deal with the whole question of the intelligence services.

This idea has a very broad appeal especially among academic people. There is a tendency on the part of academic people to favor this kind of approach, because it represents a new form of elitism. Can you picture the bright young man without practical experience understanding this field called diplomacy, deriving his views primarily from Hobbs and Machiavelli? He would be in a position to determine what the long range strategy of the United States ought to be and would be telling practical administrators, who by definition, are limited, what they ought to do in terms of a master strategy for outwitting our communist opponents. This same point of view is also found in industry. You would expect this because administration operates within a cultural context in the field of large scale industry. Thus for example, an article was written in a recent number of Harvard Business Review entitled "Management of the 1980's."⁽³⁾ The general argument was that by 1980 all of the decisions will be made by a small group of highly trained individuals, an elite, who, using machines for factorial analysis will put problems to these machines and on the basis of the results produced by these machines will determine, in terms of game theory, what each corporation ought to do. On the basis of these decisions, which, by definition, only a small number of people can understand, practical executives will then be told what their orders are. One of the results of this will be that middle management, which is now the largest group of executives in the United States, will almost entirely disappear. The result will be that by 1980 there will be only two groups -- the "think group," who, on the basis of putting problems to machines, will reach decisions, and the people, who are like automatons, will be responsible for carrying them out. At this point you can very properly say -- "What's this fellow telling us -- is he trying to scare us, or is he trying to exaggerate?" And I will tell you very honestly that I am not exaggerating. If you don't believe it, look up these articles.

Being students of psychology, you can understand more clearly than I why this sort of thinking appeals to people. They are looking for something that is better than what they have. They are aware of our shortcomings in terms of foreign policy and in terms of various other areas of decision making. Some of them are bold enough to say that we need an elite. They say that if we are going to have an elite, it ought to be an electoral elite. That takes the curse off. If we talk about the elite of wealth or talk about the elite of nationality or of religion or any other possible criterion, Americans would be opposed to it. But call it an intellectual elite, a "think group," and make the fundamental dichotomy between policy and administration and there is a certain amount of plausibility to it. I needn't tell you that I don't think this is the solution of our problem.

I think the solution of the problem is to make just a garden variety of executives -- like you and me -- better policy formulators, in order that we will not have an elite, in order that there will be more programming and more intelligent decision making. There should be a greater tendency to make programming the center of our administrative action rather than to separate the two and have a group of bright young men telling us what we ought to do. That's the end of my first comment.

The second comment is that another very important tendency in administration thinking today revolves around the concept of decision making. Decision making is a very important concept and a very necessary concept, because the thing that pays off is what you decide and how you decide and the consistency with which you decide. But, then, that begs the question, because the question is, what do you decide about? From one point of view, and this is also a very popular point of view, decision making can be divided into two parts. There are important questions, and there are unimportant questions. This ties in with the point I just developed about the new elite, the "think group." According to this dichotomy, the only questions that are important in terms of decision making are the high level decisions, and everything else is administration. Therefore, we ought to have a technique for high level decision making and forget about the rest. The trouble I find with this is that while we ought to have a technique for decision making, this technique ought to apply to all decisions. Administration is a unified field; it's an inter-related field, and there is no gradation between the most important and unimportant questions. The unimportant questions are often the important questions. Take labor relations, the field in which I happen to have had experience. You say that what a file clerk does is unimportant. My experience is, that if you don't treat file clerks right, some of the most important things you need to do are going to be jeopardized because of the resistance of the file clerk. My secretary told me during the war that we ought to have a staff conference with the secretaries and file clerks, because they are more important than my department heads.

I happen to have a high regard for my secretary, and I took her advice. I had meetings with my secretaries and department heads, and, much to my surprise, I found that the efficiency of my organization increased just about 50%, overnight. When people tell me that there is a difference between high policy, which needs to be very erudite and which is subject to some kind of a very special process, and the rest of decision making, which is simply a matter of administration, which you can sort of leave to the rule of thumb procedure, I'm very skeptical. The reason I am skeptical is this! The real test of administrative decision making is whether you achieve the goals Wayne Vasey talked about this afternoon. In order to achieve these goals you need to have all factors working together in relationships. You may introduce a model system for speedup in your factory, but if you overlook some important factors, with regard to the least paid of your employees, your entire labor staff may walk out. Therefore, if we're talking about democratic administration, we cannot afford to be aristocratic in our orientation and to say that its only the most important policy decisions that the elite ought to decide. Our position ought to be that the executives ought to be concerned with all decisions and that there is no important distinction between those that are higher and those that are lower. They are all part of a fabric because there is a certain objective that you want to achieve. As long as you deal with human beings, you can't afford to deal with low-paid employees from the standpoint of their not having the feelings, not having the sense of participation, their not having any ability to strike back, if you adopt social attitudes toward them which are aristocratic. An executive, in other words, is a person who takes all factors into account and, taking all factors into account, realizes that all policy and all programming is related. Sometimes, what can appear to be the least important aspect of a situation turns out in the final reckoning to be the most important aspect.

I'm sure this sounds very dull. I'm sure you would feel much more important, if I were to say the opposite. I wish I could oblige you. I would like to make you feel important. On the other hand, from the standpoint of my experience and from the standpoint of everything that I know about management, from the standpoint of large corporations like General Electric, General Motors, American Telephone and Telegraph, U.S. Steel, and all the corporations I have studied, I know that this aristocratic view is wrong. I know it is wrong!

An executive, therefore, in terms of program formulation, is a person who considers his total objectives in terms of all the people who participate. All the people who participate are important, and all the people who participate have roles. Hence, the really important question is whether you are able to develop a program which appeals to all these people and which fits together in terms of accomplishing what you want to accomplish. Therefore, the idea that management, in order to be successful in the United States, needs to be modeled after the Russian system of having an elite running the country, strikes me as being something that is unsound because of the fact that the results produced are not as good as if we are to maintain our democratic administration.

Now, I would like to ask you to set your minds to the questions that Wayne Vasey raised this afternoon, and, if you are so inclined, to the critical comments that I made, in order that we can advance our thinking on this question of the policy content of administration in order to improve our executive performance.

There is another point I want to develop a little bit. I referred this afternoon to Grace Abbott, who had very strong progressive views. When she died, I was asked to be one of those who paid her tribute, and I didn't do it adequately, because nobody could do it adequately for a great person like Grace Abbott. There is one thing that I learned from her life, and I hate to think that this is a generation that is now disappearing, because I hope that this tradition will be continued. Her whole orientation towards social work was that what we're interested in producing is a virile, vibrant people and virile, vibrant institutions. Social Work, therefore, as Veblen would say, or as any institutionalist in economics would say, is part of the whole cultural and economic fabric. According to this point of view, economics is not something that is separate from the culture; it is of the culture. Social work is not separate from economics; it is part of economics -- part of economics because of the fact that both economics and social work are part of culture. I think that she had a very significant viewpoint. If you analyze the various activities of her life, whether it was immigrants' protection or the Children's Bureau, you will find she was mixed up in almost everything and anything that involved human beings. You'll find that the primary motivation was the individual in terms of -- what should I call it -- case work, that is, the appeal of the personality, which, I suppose, is the ultimate value. But she didn't stop there. She was also very much concerned with the effect of policies on social work, and I suppose the activity you are in would be part of that, in terms of the whole culture, the whole economy, and the virility of the culture. I think that this is a tradition that we ought to emphasize in all of our work. Grace Abbott had a deep feeling for people. I'm using her simply as an example of others, like Jane Adams, Sophonisba Breckenridge, Edith Abbott, Katherine Lenroot, etc. At the same time, there was another aspect to them. Recipients of service were not being used for the good of society, but society was being made so that these people would have the optimum opportunity, which is what Wayne Vasey was saying this afternoon. This is the way you can reconcile the two ideas. If I may be a political philosopher for a moment, we have a choice. One choice is that we may say that the ultimate value in society is the individual, and the other choice is that the state is the ultimate of society. This is some kind of a mythical entity. The way to reconcile these two ideas is to say that instead of there being a choice between the individual -- which represents case work -- and society -- which represents the collectivity -- that there is a connecting link so that there is not a real dichotomy but rather a real unity between the two. The way we re-

concile these two is, first, in terms of value -- that the values are the same and, second, in terms of the virility of the institutions, because institutions provide the framework within which our personality and our whole ego-centric lives develop. Therefore, we cannot disassociate the two in terms of realistic analysis. This I think comes pretty close to being the core of Grace Abbott's thinking. Grace Abbott was a social worker who had a political economy orientation. This I think is the best approach to the whole problem of social work.

EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP

Dr. Marshall Dimock

Let me begin with an illustration by describing briefly an organization, of which I am a board member, which is working in the field of juvenile delinquency and employment counseling. There is another agency in this field that deals with employment counseling, but ours is the only agency that has its staff talk with boys and girls and has a list of employers that will give them jobs. This is analogous to the activities of the agencies for the blind, because these staff people are dedicated to these problem boys and girls. When there is a referral, the agency keeps in touch with the person until such time as they have satisfied themselves that he is launched upon an independent career. If he can't keep this job, he goes back to the agency, and they give him a second chance, and they try to rehabilitate him on the basis of getting him a job.

There are about fifty agencies who refer people to us. Some of them are state penal institutions -- reform schools, etc. -- and some of them are private agencies. Annually, we have an all-day session in which we are hosts, where we get executives of all of these organizations to confer with us about cooperation. The principle thing we try to get out of them is to tell us where we can improve and where we're falling down. The second thing we do is to assign the members of our staff responsibility for liaison contact with a group of these fifty agencies. Each member has a particular assignment. We do not allow them to become so busy that they do not have time to deal first hand with these agencies in terms of doing two things: first, finding out how we can improve our performance and, secondly, conferring with them about our over-all problem. The result is that when we have a meeting of our board, we start out by talking about juvenile delinquency as an over-all problem. Then we define our own narrow, little role in terms of the reports that come in from our staff about the problem as a whole, because there's always a possibility that our approach is wrong or that our approach can be improved. That's why we do this intelligence work, because it comes back into policy. On the basis of this policy, we make decisions with regard to program with regard to budget.

This has been a pretty successful program. The fifty agencies think we're pretty hot stuff. So, they come to us and they say -- "You ought to have four offices in New York instead of one." Now this is the most difficult policy question we have, because the argument is that if what we have done is successful, then, why not reproduce it? We have always decided against it, because of the following factors. A large part of our effectiveness depends upon skilled personnel. We can't find many people like our executive; it's difficult enough to find staff people. If we were to set up four organizations, the whole thing might flop. Therefore, we say (and, maybe we're just lazy -- I don't know) that if this is a good

idea somebody will pick it up and will create an agency like ours. We hope they do. We think that we had better concentrate upon this one office. I don't know whether that's the right decision or not. One of the arguments against it is that if we have a duplicating agency, one exactly like it, it's going to be more difficult for us to raise money. There will be more and more duplication. And, I don't know a field in which there is more complexity than there is, generally speaking, in the field that you represent, that is, the social work field. Therefore, from that standpoint, we might say that, since this is a good formula, since we are not taking care of the whole problem, we ought to have some branch offices. Then our executive would get a bigger salary. We don't do it and those are some of the considerations that influence us.

There seems to me to be a lesson to be learned from this experience. The lesson is this: -- Instead of bringing all fifty of these agencies together in a single organization, which will be the extreme, maybe what needs to be done in the way of coordination can be accomplished by other purposes. These purposes do not necessarily have to be extremely formalized. We do it by spending a good deal of money to serve a very nice lunch at a downtown hotel. The executives of these fifty agencies, being like newspaper men, always gather around and enjoy our libations. When we get them in a mellow mood, we talk about the problems of our agency, and, by that time, we hope that they'll be frank with us and tell us where we're falling down. Perhaps these other agencies have a better type of administration in their institutions than we do because of the fact that they emphasize the whole man in a whole society. They are not swept away by fads, whereas they say that we are faddists.

I find that the same attitude toward American development is found in other countries. I was recently in France for example, where they feel the same way. Since the end of World War II, irrespective of where you go, the prestige of the United States in the field of management has suffered. The principle reason is that they think we're faddists, that is, that we get one idea after another -- often a very good idea. Then, suddenly we will drop that idea and will go on to another. The great need today, therefore, is to take a more philosophical, balanced, practical view of what is involved in administration, both as it concerns you and me in the development of our executive skills and, also, as it involves the development of a program of all of the people with whom we work. Therefore, I want to indicate what some of the battle areas are -- the areas of great controversy -- because I have an idea that in terms of the development of administrative theory the following is true: I think that the factors that are involved in administration are everywhere the same. I think that, irrespective of whether you're dealing with administration in Turkey, as I did for a year when I was serving the technical assistance program of the United Nations; or whether you are dealing with administration in the USSR; or whether you are dealing with it in the Congo, that the factors that enter into administration are everywhere the same, leaving out of

of account the very great differences in the cultural environment in which administration operates. All I am saying is that administration consists of certain universal factors, such as, organization, people, planning, processes, leadership, delegation, coordination, control -- and everywhere these are universal. But having said that, you haven't said very much, because the real truth of the matter is that administration does operate in a cultural environment. There is a considerable difference in the way in which administration operates because of the different history and values and traditions of people. It is true that administrative skills can be rapidly lost as well as developed. Anthropologists have shown that in Turkey, for example, at one time there was more excellence in administration than any country that the world has previously seen, including China. They had a school, for example, in the 15th century that trained administrators, when Turkey ruled most of the Mediterranean. Turkey, today, is very deficient in administration. This in itself is enough to indicate that it is the total cultural situation that results in a high level of administration or a lowered level of administration.

There is another factor to be added. Although there are universal factors, and although these universal factors operate within a culture setting, there is the element of change, which Dean Vasey called attention to yesterday, which has a very profound effect upon the weight, or relative emphasis that is given to factors and combinations of factors in administration. This is why I have decided to adopt the approach that I have this morning. Let me restate my proposition. Because of change which is taking place in society, which is due to the factors which already understand -- like technology, obliteration of distance, improvement of communication, concentration versus dispersion of power, relatively large organizations versus small decentralized ones -- because of these and many other factors, there is at any time a tendency to emphasize certain aspects of administration. This is my fundamental proposition. If you don't understand what I am trying to say here, a lot of what follows will not really be comprehended.

Briefly, why is it that the British and others say that we are faddists. Shortly after the turn of the present century, the United States, due very largely to the work of engineers like Frederick W. Taylor, pioneered the scientific management movement. His idea was that the way to make administration efficient was to analyze each component down to the smallest component, in order to determine whether it was as efficient as possible from a machine standpoint, that is, from an engineering standpoint. Time and motion studies were undertaken with the idea of determining whether the smallest unit was efficient. If so, then, you analyzed each unit in the entire operation to tell whether the whole thing was efficiently operated. There was only one thing wrong with this, and that is that it left out the human element. Frederick Taylor knew this, and Frederick Taylor, when he wrote his book, said, "There is another element which is the most important of all. This element I will call cooperation." Engineers don't know anything about cooperation. The big problem in the future of management is

is to attach content to the word, cooperation, because this is more important than anything that engineers know.

Sometimes we're inclined to overlook Taylor's views, and this is part of our difficulty. We say, "Begone, begone Frederick Taylor ... Scientific management you're no good; you overlook the human element." This isn't fair. Frederick Taylor was aware of the human element. He was doing what you would expect an engineer to do. Now, one of the things that you need to consider is whether your attitude toward the engineering approach is really rationally justified. My guess is that you are mostly negative toward it. Generally speaking, because of your orientation toward people, you have an emotional negativism toward anything that smacks of the engineering approach; anything that represents scientific management. I may be wrong, but this is my guess. I don't mean to say that scientific management is passé. As a matter of fact, there has been a great revival of it recently.

Let me go on to list historically the various fads that we've followed. We got the idea that we could bring about the millenium by organization. Hence, we had a big reorganization movement both in industry and in government. We re-organized the Federal government, state governments, and city governments. Some of you lived through that. The idea was that if you had the right kind of an organization, and you had the conduit through which people's energies can flow, and if they are rational enough, people will not have frustrations. There will be a complete release of energies bringing about cooperation. The only trouble with this is that people who are organization minded sometimes go so far that they think organization is the whole of the matter. The result is that they come to have what is called the mathematical mind, the assumption being that if you are very neat and tidy like a good housekeeper, and if everything is in place, and everything is rational, that that is all that is necessary. So, here again, let's have some perspective.

Organization is important. When we take the position that organization is everything, as an organization consultant is inclined to do, then, of course, you get into trouble. The result is that after periods of great enthusiasm for organizational change, a period of disillusion sets in, and you say, "Well, this hasn't improved things." We're going through that period now. We say that the Brownlow Commission and the Hoover Commissions haven't really improved things. Therefore, we are inclined to say organization is over rated. It's not. Organization is not overrated. Organization is important in relation to many other factors. But just like any good thing, in isolation -- when carried to extreme -- it can do positive harm.

After the phase that dealt with organization, we got the idea that everything was a matter of budgets. This has a certain appeal, because if we rely upon budgets, in the first place, we'll have some semblance of planning. Secondly, the whole question of feasibility, that is cutting the cloth so as to know what you're doing -- that is, living within your means -- all of this is involved in budgeting. Therefore, the idea was that if we were merely to improve budgeting, and, especially, if we were to tie it to the office of the Chief Executive, everything would be beautiful. Now we're going through a period of disillusion. There's a movement to move the Bureau of the Budget out of the President's office and to put it somewhere else. Congress is very jealous of the Bureau of the Budget. Practical administrators say that the Bureau of the Budget has too much power. Read for example, the hearings of the Jackson committee, and you'll find that almost every prominent executive in the federal government within recent years has blasted the Bureau of the Budget, because it has too much power over policy and organization and things of that kind, that it shouldn't have. Again we reach the same conclusion. We would be foolish to assume that budgeting is unimportant but it is not the whole of administration.

Shortly after this, because of the fact that scientific management, organization, and budgeting are all pretty largely non-human, that is, they are institutional and mechanical things, nature reasserted itself, and we tended to restore the balance by emphasizing human relations. Human relations has been the great, big forward move of the last few years, due very largely to the fact that we were able to draw in certain of the skill groups, especially the psychologists, working with the sociologists and anthropologists. The result is that the thing for which America is most admired in other countries is the development of human relations approach to administration in recent years.

Now, for some reason which baffles me, we went so far in this direction that the human relations approach has come under a cloud. People say we're gone too far, and the human relations approach is not the whole of administration. We ought to go back to the thing that I have been talking about like organization, budgeting, and the engineering approach, because we have become too mawkishly sentimental. We talk too much about sweetness and life and not enough about the mechanics of getting things done. Therefore, the whole human relations approach is washed up. Is that a sensible conclusion? Of course it is not sensible; it doesn't make sense at all. Why can't we realize that these other factors are important and, at the same time, go ahead and develop the things that are good about the human relations approach and do it in balance. That's what we need to do.

This brings us to the period where we are now, and the principal emphasis at the present time is upon what I would call machine planning. The word or term for it is operational research. Operational research ties in with the subject that we were dealing with yesterday, i.e., policy formation. This is the great fad today.

Why does operations research have such a great appeal today? If you will excuse me, I will be a practical psychologist and try to tell you. We are filled with insecurities and anxieties. We have a great deference for science. We think that human relations if it's going to progress ought to be more like science. Therefore it should be precise. What is more precise than a great big IBM machine? It attempts to analyze all the factors in the decision. All you have to do is have enough human intelligence to ask the right questions of the machine, and you will get more accurate answers than you can get by taking scratch pad and a pencil, because the machine is much more efficient from that standpoint than any human ever was. Hence, the extremists, that is, the faddists are now saying management is going to be revolutionized; the human factor is going to be eliminated. There is no limit to the number of variables that can be fed into a machine. The result is that machines will be the substitutes for individuals and groups of individuals in making decisions. Then some, who are a little bit more modest, say that there will still have to be a few intelligent people in order to invent the machines and in order to ask the machines the right questions. As long as we have a few people like that, it doesn't matter what the rest of the people are like.

I hope you think that this is ridiculous when we carry it to the extreme, just as all of these other ideas are ridiculous carried to the extreme.

Today I seem to be looking into a crystal ball. I think that the next big fad in management thinking in the United States is going to revolve around the concept of planning. One of the reasons is that planning is necessary in order to improve our competitive posture vis-a-vis the USSR.

Planning is necessary because we have been thinking in short term rather than in long term as a people, and we need to get over that. Planning is necessary because of the fact that policy is so important. And we have been neglecting policy. The most difficult questions for executives in large corporations and in Washington are policy questions. Planning is necessary, because planning is one of the means of integrating all of the factors in administration. Once you start to plan you not only plan objectives but plan policies for achieving them. Then you've got to plan organization that is related to policies. You have to plan for the right kind of people to man the machine, and then you have got to go into work planning--that is, procedures, organization, and management in order to develop the right kind of orderly procedures. You can go further and plan a motivational system and a public relations system so that the whole of administration can be brought into the all-encompassing concept of planning. The same thing can be done by using the word program, as we indicated yesterday.

There is a very strong current running in favor of emphasizing planning as the new focus in administration. Let me give you just one small illustration. Not long ago I had a telephone call in New York from the vice president of a large corporation. He said, "We want to consult with you about where planning is taking place in the federal government." I asked, "Why do you want to know this?" He replied: "In the first place, we want to do more planning ourselves, and, in the second place, we think the federal government ought to do more planning. We're going to instigate that. Where is planning taking place? How can I find out about it?" I gave him some suggestions like the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Defense, Department of Agriculture -- various places that I happen to know about -- Social Security, where they are going in for long range forecasting. He was very thankful. He said that he was going to set up a project on this long range project. This is typical. Large corporations are bewildered. They are setting up departments of governmental affairs. They are beginning to think as political scientists do about survival, power, and values and what they need to do in order to become moral persons in a world which is characterized by power and immoral considerations. This is all in the air. Therefore, planning is a concept that is very much in the air.

Again, as I see the historical development of the management movement in the United States, there is another area that is emerging which is an area of great discussion. It is the whole question of the single versus the plural type of leadership -- one man versus group leadership. It is a very important issue. It is one that I think you will be particularly interested in, because, again, if I am an accurate judge of your biases, you would have more sympathy for the group method as contrasted to the lone leader type of organization.

In Industry, for a long time, there has been a tendency for the traditional pattern of the one-man rule to be replaced by a group leadership. There are many places that you can read about this, but one of the best is a book by Learned, Ulrich, and Booz, entitled, Executive Action⁽⁴⁾ which is based upon a survey of some of the largest companies in the United States. What has been happening is this: The chief executive, increasingly, has been taken out of the area of day-to-day decision making and has been converted into an institutional philosopher. The president of large firms has an executive vice president who runs the show in terms of day-to-day decisions. The result is that the president of one of these large companies, if you were to write his job description, would be, first, a symbol resembling that of the Presidency of the United States; secondly, because of the symbol, a favorable public relations asset; thirdly, an institutional philosopher, who is supposed to tell these large companies not only how to survive but also how to prosper; fourthly, he is the person who is the link with policy, that is, with the Board-of-Directors; and fifth, he is the link with all the principal interest groups, which involves

not only other officers like himself but the employees, the stockholders, the consumers, the trade unions, the government, and the competitors in the field, to mention only the most obvious ones. The term used increasingly to describe the president's role is institutional philosopher.

What a change has occurred in American life in a period of 50 to 75 years, from when the president of a firm was the robber baron, swash-buckling type, who was a benevolent despot -- sometimes, just a plain despot, who monopolized all power, who made all decisions, who justified being completely ruthless!. If you had to hire and fire men in rapid succession, it was considered necessary to make money. There has been amazing change; we are so close to it we can hardly appreciate how far-reaching it is. The result is that in one of these corporations, when it comes to important decisions with regard to policies, executives almost inevitably huddle. Depending upon what the issue is, they decide what people need to huddle; they don't always have the same group.

This is characteristic. There is, however, the area of execution once the decision has been made. Generally speaking, they use the older conventional system of one man being responsible. This is not a group affair at all. At least if there is a group responsibility, it is within the department rather than inter-departmental. There is something of a distinction here. When it comes to important policy decisions, it is, nowadays, in large business and governmental enterprise, almost exclusively a group concern. When it comes to the execution of that decision, it is still what we call the straight line, or the military type of organization, in which one person is responsible, because he has authority for seeing that the decision is carried out. Even that needs to be qualified by saying that there is far more lateral collaboration and cooperation, at all stages of execution, than there used to be.

Some of the areas in which this issue are very important today are these; There is a very decided growth of the holding company type of operation in the United States. I couldn't tell you whether there is anything analogous to that in your field. What does the holding company do? Generally speaking, the holding company is responsible for research, for standards including the standard of how much the company ought to earn, for discovery of new products, for being a personnel agency for recruiting the people for these operating companies, for setting the standards and evaluating their work, and for carrying on the power relationships, such as, building political fences for the various subsidiaries and deciding how many corporations to create. Standard Oil of New Jersey, for example, has 200 corporations, whereas when I studied it twenty years ago it had only 150.

One of the reasons that this is relevant is that this is the way the thinking is going in the Jackson committee, which is studying the structure of decision-making in the federal government. They say that one of the reasons that we have not done well in some recent instances like the U-2 and Cuba is that we do not have a definite holding company organization over and above the operating level. We try to solve that problem by giving the President a large staff. President Eisenhower, at the peak, had 3500 people. That's a lot of people. But this includes the Bureau of Budget, the National Security Council, the Central Intelligence Agency, etc. Well, this is ridiculous. That's not a very tactful way of putting it, but it is ridiculous. The proposal now is that instead of having a large staff who is not directly in line of authority to get things done -- these are not action people -- that we ought to substitute a holding company operation more comparable to that of the ones that I've been talking about, where we have full-fledged executives who divide up the responsibility. Thus, for example, Herman Finer ⁽⁵⁾ has recently written a book in which he proposes that there be eleven people who would be executives and who would divide up the work which is presently supposedly being done by the President.

The development of size has led to the creation of the holding company concept which is found not only in Industry but in Government. This is one of the broad social institutional developments in the United States that is likely to affect you. You say, "Why?" Well, because you are also part of the same culture. If enough people become enamoured of the idea of the holding company device, then you are bound to be affected, even though you may reject the concept entirely.

The third area of growth that I want to call attention to and that deserves some consideration is the reverse of what I have been talking about. Planning has a tendency to centralize. One of the intellectual arguments that can be made for planning is that everything is brought together at the top. You are bound to know more than anybody can know down the line. Hence, if you bring together everything at the top there is more possibility of integrating all the factors into a workable program than if you don't do it. This is probably the strongest rational argument that can be made in favor of planning. Likewise, the idea of group leadership, especially the holding company, has a tendency to centralize. The third development that I am going to refer to is an illustration going back to my original thesis: Administration is a matter of combining seeming opposites in order to maintain necessary balances or equilibriums. The third area is delegation. This is a question that is bound to have a direct relevance to what we do, irrespective of whether the two things I've talked about previously are as germane to your work as they are to the work of some others.

The fundamental problem of management is one that Rousseau called attention to a long time ago. I suppose if you want to go back further, you can also find it in the Bible and the teachings of Jesus, where He talks about the Pharisees and the Spirit. But, the fundamental problem is this: The big problem is to keep the human spirit alive in the artificial framework of large institutions. This comes close to describing your fundamental problem, because the question that you're always struggling with is the case work ~~approach~~ approach, which is highly subjective and individual, versus the institutional approach, which takes up the whole family organization, the whole community organization, the whole organization of the economy. This is your fundamental problem, I am sure. This is the fundamental problem of Management, too. This is, probably, the fundamental problem of political philosophy for all time. What seems to happen in the United States is that we have gone so far towards changing our original conceptions of a good society, that instead of having thousands of competitive units, we tend, more and more, to have few large ones; that, instead of assuming that the smaller the enterprise and the more competitive it is, the more efficient it will be. We now assume that in order to compete with the Russians we need to match fire with fire, and therefore, we must have large institutions like their institutions.

Some correlaries are that the government must do more and more. In short, within the period of the last 50 to 75 years, if we are honest with-ourselves, there has been a terrific centralization in the United States. Because of this centralization, the individual tends to be swamped, engulfed, submerged. The result is that, if you could go into the households of many executives, you would find that they were secretly applauding everything that William Whyte says in The Organization Man,⁽⁶⁾ because they are so conscious of the fact that they are the "grey flannel suit", that they are submerged, and that they are restricted. Generally speaking, they are unhappy. The reason I can say this is that, since the 1930's, I have probably interviewed more executives of large corporations than anyone in the United States, usually man-to-man in confidence rather than with people in their own group. In their own group they cannot say the things that they can say to you individually.

The problem of bigness is this: There is a certain power which comes from concentration. I don't suppose I need to prove that to you. Just like a rocket thrust: The bigger the concentration of power, the higher it goes into the air. At the same time, there is also a loss of efficiency due to concentration itself, the reason being that there is less scope for the individual; there is less incentive for the individual; there is less opportunity for experimentation; there is less of a sense of responsibility. The larger the organization becomes, the more concentrated it becomes; the greater is the dispersion of responsibility until the point may arrive when responsibility is almost entirely lacking, because there is nobody that you can pin it upon.

The question in administration is always, "How can you have the best of both worlds?" Ordinarily we think it can't be done. It happens that you can have both; or, at least, you can try. There are certain advantages in centralization, in concentration, in power; there are inherent weaknesses in the same. Therefore, the problem is how to get the efficiency out of both. Applying this to your field, there is undoubtedly an efficiency in the case work method. But, it's possible that this isn't the whole of the matter. There are other areas that ought to be combined with the case work approach in order to develop the ideal approach. I'm not in a position to tell you whether that is true, but on the basis of what I know about other fields of management, I would suspect it is true. It is the reason why one of the primary emphases today in management's thinking is upon delegation. They are trying to develop more of the self-reliant, decision-making, independent, entrepreneurial type of person in order to offset the tendency of centralization, which robs people of these characteristics and makes them merely automatons.

The obvious way to get the best out of both is now clear. If top management can concentrate upon the objectives; and it, through good communication, they can tell people all the way down the line what their mandate is and then give them a part in arriving at conclusions with regard to objectives; and if top management can give them increasingly more scope; then all of the things that are lacking, because of the tendency toward centralization, are likely to be returned in some measure, if not completely. Of course, no one will ever have the scope that he has when he is entirely on his own.

The argument, then, is that, insofar as you can give the individual scope within a large organization, you get both kinds of efficiency -- the efficiency of size and the efficiency of the individual. There are, however, some very serious problems.

One problem, obviously, is that although you may pay lip service to the idea of having everybody involved in establishing the objectives and making the policies, it is much easier to do it yourself and tell them about it later. Another problem is that once somebody makes a mistake, you have a tendency not to repeat that error again, which means that you strip that function of its authority. You don't merely get rid of the individual; you tend more and more to keep things close to your vest. In all of the studies that I've ever made, there is a tendency toward decentralization and delegation and a swinging back, just like the swinging pendulum, as described by Aristotle, which is the fundamental law of politics. I would suspect that this tendency would affect you, if you are the sort of optimistic self-reliant person who is able to delegate.

There is always a very great danger that you will be disappointed on occasion. Then the acid test is: Are you self reliant enough to try it again? Some people never do. The result is that they automatically limit themselves in terms of what they can accomplish. Another difficulty is that the more you delegate, the more you have to coordinate. The more you delegate, the more you have to control. By control, in case you don't understand exactly what I mean, I refer to the setting of standards or norms for determining what acceptable practice is. For example, if you tell the head of one of your divisions that he has a certain amount of money to work with, and he is supposed to get a certain amount of mileage out of this, then the control function is to see that he does that. This is another area, where, if I judge correctly, you are very likely to be emotionally negative. You don't like the idea of control, because you are humanistically oriented, and control sounds like engineering and mechanics, which you don't like.

At this point, I would be inclined to argue that, in terms of rational comprehension, you ought to change your attitude towards the concept of control, because control, in terms of the total context in which administration operates, can be humanized as an essential ingredient. Let me explain. You have an employee that you want to develop. You want to make life interesting for him. So, you give him a norm and, therefore, give him a challenge. If he doesn't make it, then you and he analyze why he didn't make it. When he goes above the norm, you pat him on the back and promote him and give him larger responsibilities. We all need this. If you don't think this is true, just ask any group of executives who retired from business or from government. Ask them what they miss most about their work. They will say it is the challenge of it. Even people who have a great deal of money will tell you this. The reason that it is hard to give up is because of the challenge of it--not because of the great amount of money that they make but because of the challenge of it. If this is true, then, one of the things that we ought to think about is making administration challenging. Actually, administration can be more of a challenge than any other field of life. I am not merely soft-soaping you. This is true. It has far more challenge than, for example, being a surgeon or being a lawyer. The reason is that the number of variables you have to pull together in terms of your mind and your personality--your total being--makes more of a demand upon you than any other field. It is more like being a portrait painter, which requires a highly integrative skill and which takes a lot of artistry, or being an orchestra leader, which takes a lot of artistry and a lot of integration. In other words, one of the universals in life is artistry; artistry is found in all people. Artistry is needed in executives. One reason that artistry is needed is because artistry is one of the ways of integrating the factors that we have been talking about, some of which are non-human, some of which are human--all of which are essential in terms of the job that needs to be done.

If we were successful in delegation, we would do more, I think, to strengthen our institutions than in almost any other area of administration. If we were to do a good enough job of delegation, giving people more responsibility, we would solve the problem of leadership. If we don't, we will not, because here is our dilemma. Let us be realistic about it. The larger and more concentrated our institutions are, the greater is the demand upon executive skills. By the very conditions of these institutions, people are disqualified from measuring up to their responsibilities. You may believe this is a terribly pessimistic comment, but it is true. I'll say it again. The larger and more concentrated our institutions the more they militate against the production of those human characteristics which are necessary for adequate executive performance. This is why Rousseau said that the more dehumanizing the institutions are, the harder you have to work in order to restore the balance and to keep people human. This is one of the reasons it seems to me that we ought to do more in the field of education and, also, in the field of religion, in order to help restore this balance.

I must now go on to my last point. I have talked about planning, group leadership, delegation, and coordination. The other area that I think is very active is motivation. It comes closer to dealing with human relations than anything I've touched upon so far. People often ask what the governors were most surprised at when we studied the administration of the USSR. Incidentally, we went to state and local republics, -- five of them within 10,000 miles -- and we interviewed about 250 officials, including all kinds of administrators. The thing that surprised us most was that the Russians seemed to be doing more in terms of introducing motivational behavior into administration than we are. This is really alarming. Having said that, I'm not going to suggest that we ought to imitate them, because this would be the wrong approach. I would suggest, however, that one of the things you and I ought to do is to consider whether we are laggards when it comes to making adequate use of motivation in terms of the work we do. I would hazard a guess that we are all lazy, that we are all falling down on the job. I'm opposed to motivation that is manipulative, that is done simply because you think that you're going to get more production, or that you are going to get more efficiency. I have more respect for human personality than that. Having said that, I don't think that we have disposed of the problem, because we can still think in terms of motivation and do so in an altruistic, idealistic way, which is the way I suggest. What are some of the things that we are neglecting in terms of motivation? The basic thing is that we are not giving enough attention to administrators in terms of the satisfactions that they ought to get out of their work. We should do more to help them become rounded individuals, who, because of that, achieve happiness. This is found in all Greek philosophy. It comes down through John Stuart Mill and the Utilitarians. It goes all the way back to Confucius and comes down to present day. Happiness is the result of the growth of the individual in terms of rounded development. This ties in with what I said about delegation as well as motivation.

Another area of motivation that we need to think about is the whole question of rewards for outstanding achievement. One of the things that the Russians are doing is to use financial incentives, I think, in a very effective way. We talked to the Director of the University of Moscow, who told us about one of his faculty members who had received two awards, one the equivalent of \$50,000 and the other the equivalent of \$25,000, since the war -- or \$75,000 -- all of which is tax exempt. This is their policy. I think it makes sense. I think that our income tax laws ought to be revised, so that when people do something really creative they would have the advantage of the awards being tax free.

Another thing we discovered in the USSR is that they originally had the idea that all people ought to be paid the same. Now they are going just as rapidly as they can toward differentiation. Even in collective farms they now have five different scales of pay for the farmers who own the farms, since they realized that there was that much difference in the contribution the individual farmer made. When we asked Mr. Krushchev about this and told him that it was capitalistic and tried to shame him, he sort of got the better of us by saying, "Well, we do anything that is hardheaded and practical. We used to think that you were hardheaded and practical, too." In other words, he cuts the ground out from us. We say that these things are capitalistic, and he says, in effect, "I don't care whether they are capitalistic or not, if they work." In this particular respect, I'd just as soon imitate. I think this is a sound point of view. We ought to do the things that work.

Another thing that we're not doing enough about is what they are doing in Britain and certain other countries, that is, non-financial incentives or recognition. I do not advocate that we give titles, but, certainly, there are many opportunities for giving recognition that we are not making use of. I would say that we are more unimaginative about this whole area of non-financial incentives than any other area in the whole field of management in the United States. I am as guilty as you are. My wife is constantly telling me that the more efficient one of my associates is, the more I take him for granted, and I know that's true. I would bleed and die for these people, but I never give them a pat on the back or a kind word or tell them that they are wonderful. I'm just not built that way. Generally speaking, in the American environment we are all more or less that way. People don't get enough satisfaction out of administrative work, and I think that a large part of the responsibility is due to higher supervisors.

There is another area of incentives that I don't need to talk about, because people in your work and the field that Dean Vasey and I are in have it, or we wouldn't be in this work. This is the altruistic incentive. In many fields, it is being very badly neglected. One of the best evidences of it is again found in the USSR. We hadn't been in Russia very long when we read in their English language newspaper a

headline as follows: MATERIAL INCENTIVES NOT ENOUGH; LOYALTY TO THE COUNTRY AND TO THE PARTY ARE MORE IMPORTANT. In other words, you must be public spirited and patriotic, and you must not think only of yourself. As I understand it from my friends who are experts, this is one of the significant new developments in Russia. It has a very interesting bearing upon the whole attitude toward religion, because this is, obviously, an attempt to compensate for what is usually very basic in human nature, i.e., trying to emphasize the non-materialistic incentives. The British are clear on this. The British are clear on this. The British have said from the very beginning that for outstanding leadersthe highest and most effective incentive is always the most altruistic one. This is one reason why British administratorshave been so outstanding. There is a very great opportunity of using this incentive in the United States more effectively than we do. We need these altruistic incentives everywhere, in business and in labor and in all fields. If we don't have it, there's a very great danger that we will be in serious trouble.

SUMMARY

A segmented approach to administrative performance may be worse than no approach at all. People who use their common sense are more inclined to consider all of the factors and to weld them together than people who, being partisans of a narrowpoint of view, tend to develop lopsided personalities and lopsided approaches. This is why I said yesterday (and I was first told this by Karl Menninger) that the principles of administration are also the principles of mental health.

I didn't realize that this was true at the time, but I am now convinced of it. I think that a well-adjusted, integrated, balanced individual is the key to a well-balanced administration. Therefore, the principles of mental health are also the principles of administration.

We have not followed this sound rule, because we have tended to take one aspect of the problem after another and assumed that this was the whole of it. We have not yet completely got over this difficulty, because there are certain developments which, again, are likely to get things out of balance. I have mentioned some of them -- operations research as related to planning, group leadership, delegation, coordination, and motivation.

Motivation is basic to all these other things, but a great deal depends upon how you use it. If you use it in a manipulative way, and it is obvious to all of your employees that they are just being treated like guinea pigs, you will probably have a net negative effect, whereas motivation more soundly conceived can be one of the principle means of vitalizing administration. In terms of internal integration, I have tried to call attention to some of the principal areas that seem to be most important today without attempting to mention all of the factors.

Personnel

Wayne Vasey

This afternoon, I am not going to summarize or repeat what was so ably presented this morning. I am however going to act as a commentator, rather than a summarizer. I want to comment, first, on how valuable it is to me to think back on the principle of balance. Any good thing can be bad if taken in too large a measure. You will recall that point in connection with many of the trends which became fads, which were, in many instances, spoiled by extravagant or exorbitant reliance on them or undue usage.

I am going to begin this afternoon with the question or problem of the selection of an executive, the question of whether he shall be an expert in the field, a professionally oriented person, a business-type person, or an individual who -- in the true sense of the word -- is a generalist. I am reminded of the play, movie, and book -- which many of you may have seen or read -- called, Executive Suite. Do you remember those three characters who were vying for the presidency? One was the accountant, the orderly fiscal management type man; the other was a salesman, the promoter type that could push the agency forward as far as public relations were concerned, and the third, as I recall, was the hero of the piece. He was the engineer, the production man, the man to whom the product and the quality of the product was the thing. A specialist? Yes! Technically qualified? Yes.

Now, the inference I would draw would be that all three of the skills were required. Instead of a submerged personality, I understand we really would have ^{to have} this combination of qualities available at the leadership spot. We've long struggled with this question: Shall the administrator be an expert in some field? We have, of course, the rigorous demands of programs which are becoming more and more technical and require more and more technical insight for understanding and planning. On the other hand, we have the never-ending need for the whole person, the culturally oriented person, the person who is a part of society, the whole man. So we have these two contending needs, in a sense.

Laskey, the British social economist, was inclined to the belief that we should not have a specialist in charge of programs. He wrote a pamphlet, a number of years ago, called, The Limitations of the Expert. (17) The burden of his remarks were that the expert sacrifices the insight of common sense to the intensity of his experience. He is all too prone to make decisions within the narrow confines of the technical exactions of his own profession rather than in relation to broad community needs or policies.

For example, he would have doctors in technical charge of health programs but probably not making the policy for the health agency. This was Laskey's thesis, and he presented it with considerable eloquence.

We recognize that there is a necessity for leadership, but can we have leadership if we are completely disassociated from a value system? Is there reenforcement of the executive position in the value system? I often think of the example of the Children's Bureau, which operates under a very broad mandate to report, to make studies, and to give reports on studies and on all matters pertaining to the welfare of children. What a broad mandate that was! When you get right down to it, you could have had almost anything. But, the imprint of Julia Lathrop, Grace Abbott, and Katherine Lenroot made it the kind of program it is because of the value system which each carried and which dominated so much of their thinking. The Children's Bureau might not have been the vital, dynamic organization it has been, since its inception in 1912, without this orientation.

Another example is that of Jane Hoey and her influence in the Public Assistance Program. It could have been a technically based eligibility program without much emphasis on service, if it hadn't been for the creative leadership given by Jane Hoey, who derived some of her creativity of ideas from the ethos of the profession with which she was identified. So, there is a role for professional identity. I have often hypothesized that one of the troubles with the Unemployment Insurance Program in so many states stems from the fact that it had no professional base. It isn't psychology. It isn't social work. It isn't law. It has no professional value system to which to relate. I think that a program loses something when it doesn't have this professional value system as a basis for relating.

While we can sympathize with the Laskey thesis that the expert should not have absolute final control over all matters of public policy in this program, we don't want to throw out the strength of leadership which a person who is professionally based may bring to a program. I wish to make that point quite strongly. Perhaps, again, it is a question of balance. If the expert is not capable of what Harleigh Trecker and Arlien Johnson both called, "bifocal vision," that is, to see both his own profession and public policy needs and demands then there is a danger that the expert will be too much concerned with promoting the cause of his expertise and not enough concerned with developing not only a good program but one consistent with public policy and community needs.

When we have a person in a position of leadership, is the need simply for careful management? Do you recall Captain Queeg of the Caine Mutiny? He was a good manager and kept everything shipshape. I doubt, however, that he could have won a battle. In that sense, he

wasn't really a good manager but a good housekeeper. As Marshall Dimock indicated, he would rather have an organization that is doing something than one that is perfectly neat and not accomplishing anything.

Now I want to deal with the concept of delegation. I call it Delegation by Plan, rather than by whim. If I were preaching a sermon on this, I would take my text from the House at Pooh Corner. Now, there's a very fine book on administration. It has many lessons in it. The House at Pooh Corner has a little passage about Rabbit. It goes:

It was going to be one of Rabbit's busy days. As soon as he woke up he felt important, as if everything depended upon him. It was just the day for Organizing Something, or for Writing a Notice Signed Rabbit, or for Seeing What Everybody else thought about It. It was a perfect morning for hurrying around to Pooh, and saying, "very well, then, I'll tell Piglet," and then going to Piglet, and saying, Pooh thinks, - but perhaps I'd better see Owl first! It was a Captainish sort of day, when everybody said, "Yes, Rabbit," and "No, Rbbit," and waited until he had told them.

That's a charming vignette, which shows a kind of rushing around, of reassurance that you are being very busy and very quick and very efficient but not really communicating with staff by any kind of plan.

One of Mary Parker Follett's central principles was that, "Authority resides in function." This is planned delegation in which there is an authority inherent in every function of the organization. I think this is a very important principle. Administrators, you may have a particular problem along this line when you have a multi-discipline agency, because some authority resides in function by virtue of membership in a profession. For instance, a hospital administrator had better not tell a doctor what to prescribe. There are limitations on the authority of the executive over the head of surgery. The latter's authority resides in his function and is reenforced by his professional identity and his acknowledged expertise.

This, again, is an extremely important concept which requires a balanced view. We say that a person should have the authority which is vested in a function which he performs and in a position which he holds. It can be overdone, too, by establishing a series of little compartments in which there is so much authority residing in the function that nothing ever gets beyond this little compartment. This is frequently where I think you may find bottlenecks. While it is important to have authority residing in function, the responsibility for communication and for relating this authority to the needs of the organization, rather than to your own desires or interests or whims, is also important. That, again, is the principle of balance, the balancing of the authority of the individual's function with the responsibility for agency-wide performance. I think

we should always keep in mind the fact that a person not only holds a position, but he is a member of the organization in which there is a responsibility of participation and membership. We know that this kind of participation can be very exhilarating. Perhaps it can mean as much to staff as anything else.

Another aspect of authority residing in function is the need which each person has for investing his person with dignity, which derives from what he perceives to be the importance of his job. You are familiar, undoubtedly, with Robert Frost's poem, Death of the Hired Man. The Hired Man bundled every forkful in its place. He was so meticulous, and he made a real production out of his work. He was that kind of a hired man. He needed to invest himself with the dignity of doing something which is so important that it must be done very well. I can remember ditchdiggers back in Iowa who were almost geologists. (We do have this need to invest a job with dignity and a person with dignity and a job of importance.) Recognition of this need should be constant on the part of the executive. It's something that needs to be a part of the makeup of the executive. It may be easier to do with highly placed professionals than with some clerical staff, but, nevertheless, it is very important to all.

Another concept that Mary Parker Follett wrote about was the concept of the configuration, that is, the totality of the organization. Each part of the organization must be seen in relation to each other part and, also, to all other parts in the total structure. That's the way it has to be perceived ^{and} you, as an executive, have to be the person who perceives it. Each job must be seen in relation to each other job, each part in relation to the totality, if you're going to have a real honest-to-goodness functioning organization.

Mary Parker Follett had another principle. She talked about the three ways of achieving agreement -- Domination, Compromise, and Integration. By the process of domination, one party gets his own way completely. By compromise, nobody gets what he wants. Integration means a fusion of ideas, an acceptance of points-of-view, a merging. Integration is quite different from compromising. Compromise requires two people with entrenched positions from which they will not budge until a middle ground is found. Integration is the process of agreement, coalescing of ideas with an outcome which is to everybody's satisfaction. How useful it would be in an organization to carry out this principle of integration of ideas through working with other people. There are people who can say "Good morning," as if they were trying to start a fight. A lot of times, much depends upon how a question is posed and whether you exercise the skill of avoiding solidly entrenched positions which will require some emotional cost before they can be surrendered or given up to the other person.

Another point I want to make relative to administration is one which pertains to how regulations, procedures, and policies are

communicated by management or the executive person to a group of staff. The amount of detail in procedure, rules and regulations, or policy will vary inversely with the competence of management and the competency of staff.

Now, many people say that's the source for what we commonly call the bureaucratic error of spelling out too much, of trapping people in a maze of regulations from which they can't extricate themselves, or placing a premium on memorization of the manual or the handbook rather than on the exercise of knowledge, of skill, and of individual ability. That is not necessarily a fair comment, because the pressure for detail frequently comes from the staff as well as from management. Staff frequently say: "We ought to have a policy on this." "We ought to have this written out." "Spare me the pain of making a decision." "Let's make a policy." So, out of the temerity of staff frequently come pressure for more and more detailed specifications of policy, rules and regulations, and procedures.

This is certainly something I felt most keenly when I worked in a federal agency. I was also conscious of the fact that at the local level you frequently put pressure on the State to give you decision. In a large agency you get this from staff. That's the other side of this problem. Anyway, I think I would certainly agree very heartily with what was said this morning -- that the measure of an organization is not the avoidance of error. Rather, there is one fundamental error an agency can make and that is continually trying to avoid error or taking any chances. This is the fundamental error. An organization which is accomplishing something will make errors. It has to incur that risk. Individuals will have to incur the risk of error. The measure of an organization, then, is not whether it makes errors but whether it survives them and utilizes them constructively in the development of policy. That's another very important point.

Dr. Marshall Dimock

Community Relations

As one looks at our three subjects -- program planning, internal administration, and community organization -- it's obvious that there is a considerable connection between the first and the last day. The first day was outward-looking in terms of policy, which is, as Wayne Vasey said, a matter of analyzing the need and adjusting to the need in terms of developing a program and a long range plan. Now we are going to consider a new level of relationship -- the relationship of the agency to its public. Public is defined in a very broad way to include other agencies in the same field; to include the clientele that's being served; to include the interest groups which grow out of the economy, like labor and capital, agriculture and so forth; to include the relationship to government, understanding the relationship between public and private effort; and to include the relationship among skill groups. This, generally speaking, is what we mean when we talk about this particular level of relationship.

Wayne Vasey and I are going to divide up this session. The question very properly arises. "How can you divide up a subject so that each of two participants can have a part of it that is distinguishable, that is complimentary, without duplicating?" I don't know that it's particularly important that we should have a completely clean cut division of responsibility. As a matter of fact, I think that, on the basis of the philosophy we have been developing, it would be better if there were a good deal of dovetailing. Generally speaking, I'm going to talk about public relations from the standpoint of the operating executive. Wayne Vasey is going to talk about community organization and relations from the standpoint of the operating executive. There is, obviously, a good deal of connection, but the basis of the distinction is that public relations is a part of the executive job. Therefore, I am going to be asking, "What does the executive do if he is going to be effective in this area?" Wayne Vasey is going to ask, "What should the executive do in terms of community organization and relationships amongst professional groups, in order to serve the public welfare?"

If you look on page 3 of the outline, you will find that most of the questions asked here were referred to by Wayne Vasey's part of this discussion. What do the programs for the blind, voluntary and governmental, reflect in relation to community planning? Are they developing responsively? How active are executives and boards of agencies and participants in the community planning? To what extent do administrators act as spokesmen for their clientele? To what extent should they? How effectively are the resources of the agency being utilized by the community?

If there is any differentiation between these 6 points, I would say that I am more likely to talk to 4 and 5 and Wayne Vasey to the others.

There is also something that he says in his letter to me in which he discusses the three-day program. Perhaps in terms of briefing you at the outset, I ought to read this:

Today's session will deal with community processes. There is a whole range of material here. Agencies for the Blind are caught up in the question of their function in relation to family service agencies, mental health clinics, rehabilitation centers, and others. How are the functions of each determined in relation to the others? This question should provoke considerable discussion

In talking about public relations, from the standpoint of the operating executive, I first want to call your attention to the fact that in the United States, more than any other country in the world today and, perhaps, more than any other country in the world's history, public relations is big business. This is quite remarkable. You become more impressed with this the more you travel around the world. I have just been in Switzerland for the last twelve weeks where I was making a study of their government. So far as I can ascertain, there is no public relations carried on anywhere within the Swiss Government. From the Commune up to the Canton, which is equivalent to our state and to the federal government, there is no public relations program carried on as we understand it, that is, no trained staff, no expenditure of money for public relations. The whole job is done by the press. The press is a remarkable press. They have a very strong sense of public responsibility for educating people. Democracy in Switzerland is a very real thing. The newspapers set a very high standard of objectivity, even when they are identified with political parties. This is unlike anything I have ever seen in the world. It seems so strange to an American, because the newspapers are so objective, and there is so little attempt on the part of the government to influence thought. In contrast, during the war, when I worked for the War Shipping Administration, we had about fifty people in our public relations division, many of them experts in various media. In my own program we had additional staff. We had a headquarters staff and a director in each of our four regions. In another division of the War Shipping Administration, which dealt with training and which worked very closely with us, they took recruits who had some background in newspaper work or various areas of communication. The result was that there were no less than 50 people in the maritime service who were concerned with public relations. This gives you some idea of how we emphasize this function. The subject has been dealt with by McCamy in the book, Government Publicity, (9) and by Leo Roston, one of the editors of Look, in a book on Washington Correspondents, (10) on giving the story of governmental public relations.

Despite the fact that we emphasize public relations so much, you don't need a great deal of historical perspective to see that a rather considerable change has occurred in thinking about this question in the last few years. Just as I dealt with trends in the field of management thinking, I want to deal initially this morning with trends in thinking about public relations.

Perhaps the best way to explain the changes that are taking place is that public relations in the 1920's was aimed primarily at volume. You may remember an old play, entitled, It Pays to Advertise, and you may remember a line from that play, "Whether they praise you, or curse you, keep them talking about you". This was pretty well the epitome of public relations. If you talk with any business executive who lived through that period this is what he will tell you. Public relations is perhaps the most important part of management, because it determines what people think. If you have a service to sell, like telephone service, for example, it's almost impossible to determine accurately how much it's worth economically. What people think of the telephone service is all important. Therefore, if people think very highly of the telephone service, most problems are solved. Even when there is inefficiency in the service, people are inclined to overlook this, because, generally speaking, they have such a favorable attitude toward the Telephone Company. During the 1920's, the whole idea was to put out a barrage of advertising and propaganda, all of which was called public relations, for the purpose of keeping the name so indelibly before the public that people would come to have a favorable attitude. These same people will tell you today that they got burned. They learned a lesson during the 1920's. This is particularly true as illustrated by the Electrical Utilities. Remember the investigation, the giant power investigation in the 1920's, when it was discovered that the Electrical Utilities had spent something like 40 million dollars in one year? Among other things, they had subsidized professorships, and they carried on a campaign to try to besmirch and belittle government to give people a negative attitude toward it. This is the most graphic illustration of how you can get burned in public relations. The result of all this experience has brought about a gradual change in regard to executive thinking in public relations during the 1930's and the 1940's and the 1950's. The best place to discover the general metamorphosis of thinking is in a series of books that has been published on public relations. I list fifty of them in the chapter on "Public Relations" in my textbook, Public Administration.() Since this book came out two years ago, it is fairly up to date.

Perhaps the best way to explain the changes that have taken place is to be concrete by referring to a man that, in my opinion, was one of the most successful public relations man any large corporation has ever produced, Arthur W. Page. He was vice President of AT&T. He died within the past year. He probably had more influence on the policies of AT&T over a period of 30 years than any other man in that

huge corporation, which is the largest in the country. He is a very good illustration of how a man's philosophy and his personality and even his religion influence the policies of a large company. Arthur Page was steeped in utilitarian philosophy. He believed that the most important thing in life is to reconcile private and public interests; he believed that everybody has a social obligation and that the principal forces which regulate the ethics of individuals are the concepts of pleasure and pain. If you do the right thing, in terms of your individual activity or your corporate activity, you get pleasure; that is happiness. If you do the wrong things, you get pain. Because of this there are sanctions and rewards. What you are working for is reward, and what you try to avoid is pain. For example, if AT&T behaves itself, it will be prosperous, if it doesn't behave itself, eventually the government will take it over, and it will no longer be private enterprise. This was the basis of all Page's calculations. Because he had this philosophy, he developed a concept which has to do with institutional survival. I have been very much influenced by this myself, as you will discover when you take a look, for example, at Administrative Vitality. () Survival is the theme of that book. Arthur Page defined survival in a rather unusual way but a way that I find very realistic. Survival is not a matter of simply keeping the breath of life in the human body. Survival is a matter of vitality, a matter of health. That being the case, survival, interpreted as an institutional operation, means doing that which is found pleasing in the eyes of the public, enjoying a good reputation, having the resiliency, the bounce to respond to crises. The unusual thing about Arthur Page's definition of survival was that survival is not only staying alive, it's keeping your health -- and keeping your health in such a way as to respond so favorably to public expectations that you create pleasure and avoid pain. On the basis of this philosophy, he arrived at certain conclusions with regard to what public relations is and is not.

Public Relations, first of all, needs to be distinguished from advertising. Advertising sells a product. Public Relations is concerned with the institution and its survival. This means that the institution's health, vitality, and reputation is what is involved. At this point you might say I am being academic, since the reputation of an institution is also determined by its product. Its product is in the field of advertising, and, therefore, you can't separate these things. You can't do that kind of sleight of hand. I agree. But, in terms of deciding what the executive ought to do, this is an important distinction. I would be prepared to defend the position of Arthur Page, namely, that in terms of what the executive ought to do, he should think of public relations primarily as a management concept and not only a management concept but as the very essence of management. If you agree with this, and this is the first controversial point, it makes a lot of difference how you go at it. One of the ways firms did, in the 1920's, was to turn over the whole public relations program to an advertising

agency. The idea was that the more money you put into advertising the better your reputation was going to be. It didn't work that way. I don't believe it works that way now. Hence the second controversial thing I want to say is that the success of a public relations program does not depend upon the volume of money you spend; it depends upon the skill with which you think out the objectives of the program, the policies of the program, and gear them to the internal administrative program.

The next thing that I wanted to say is that, of all the things that the executive needs to watch closely -- and every business man will tell you this -- the two that are most important are public relations and personnel. Between the two, there is an obvious connection. Personnel are the symbols; they are the windows in your edifice. People see these public figures. Therefore, their image of the program is determined very largely by the type of personalities you use. If I were to mention, for example, the name of Chester Barnard, a very large proportion of you would know that he is one of the outstanding writers in the field of administration in the country. He is probably immortal in terms of the book that he wrote, The Functions of the Executive. () He is an AT&T man, again illustrating how outstanding individuals have a very important part in determining the image which the public has of a program. I don't want to develop that theme; I do want to develop the theme that public relations is a small, high level, integrated policy program, a large part of the responsibility for which falls upon the executive himself.

The next controversial thing that I want to say is that a public relations staff ought to be small, ideally even in large agencies consisting of one principal advisor. You say, --"How is this possible? Why did you have fifty people on your staff in the War Shipping Administration?" My answer is that it was a mistake. If we had one good man, we would have been better off than with fifty of them. The reason is that we had people who were doing things that were directly competitive with what the press was doing, with what television was doing. We were writing programs, and that's not the way to make friends and influence people. As a matter of fact, this is one of the controversial areas. I believe very strongly that you don't compete with the commercial media but, rather, have their confidence and confine yourself to giving them an interest in writing up newsworthy stories, feature articles, making radio programs, television programs; but, don't be directly competitive with them. In the War Shipping Administration we didn't follow that rule. I will testify, and I am sure that many of you can testify to the same thing, that the best stories that ever came out during the war that dealt with war shipping were not written by our staff. They were written by people on the outside, who became sufficiently interested in what we were doing, very largely, because of a patriotic interest. They did a good job of writing a news article, writing a radio program, or making a television program.

What I am saying is that public relations ought to be small. One reason that it should be small is that it is the center of concern of the chief executive.

Having staked out this principle, and I am sure you don't all agree with this, I want to deal next with how the executive develops the public relations program that is aimed at survival. If my hypothesis of defining that term as Arthur Page does is correct, and if public relations is an integral part of everything that the executive does, then there is a logical sequence in developing a public relations program. The first thing that the executive does is to use the statement of objectives and policies for everything that follows in the public relations program. What he tries to do is to create an identification of all parties of interest with the social objective of his program. Let me illustrate: Our symbol in the War Shipping Administration was the seaman who had been torpedoed and who was going through a great sacrifice. This was to give people a realization that the Armed Services were not the only agencies that were sacrificing to win the war. What the corporation does, therefore, is to try to use its statement of policy in such a way as to develop a symbolism.

Now, here is one of the controversial areas. Organizations have a whole series of things that they do. AT&T, for example, has an organization of its twenty-five-year men, its fifty-year men; these are the pioneers; they get prestige. General Motors -- and I am sure this was a mistake -- tried to make its executives and employees loyal by showing them movies made by the company on paid time. The effect of this was, so far as labor was concerned, to cause them to be more antagonistic to the company than they had been before. They didn't like to be propagandized, either through the pay envelope or on company time. In other words, this is another illustration of some of the terrible boners that are made in terms of public relations.

All of these illustrations point to the fact that, after you have a statement of objectives and the policies, you try to symbolize it; you try to create an image. I think we all do that, one reason being that we get a lot of satisfaction out of imagery. One of the universals of public relations, after you've done the rational job of determining objectives and policy, is to try and convert them into some kind of a symbolism. One of the reasons is that people are a combination of intelligence plus sentiment. They like logic, sometimes, and they also like the beautiful and the aesthetic. Therefore, in terms of man's nature, it's not merely enough to be rational; it's necessary, also, to develop a symbolism.

The next step in the public relations program is this: The best advertisement of the program is its employees. During the 1930's public relations was almost entirely aimed at the public. Since that time, the big change that has taken place is that increasingly public relations have been aimed internally at the employees, the idea being that a satisfied, loyal, boosting employee is the best advertisement for the companies and its policies and even for its product. This gets into a very controversial area. It raises the whole question of propaganda, thought control,

conditioning people, using all kinds of subtle influences analagous to psychological warfare to get people attuned to the interest of the company. This whole question is dealt with in White's book, The Organization Man.⁽⁶⁾ Right now there is a revolt against this sort of thing. It's a very strong revolt. Companies who have attempted to mold the attitudes and the opinions of their executives are paying a price for it. Let me give you an illustration. Recently I was asked to speak to a group of executives of a large company; they said we want you to talk about bigness, because you deal with it in your book. We want you to be as frank and honest with us as you can be. I must admit that I had a certain amount of fear and trembling, because I thought that these guys were really laying for me and that they probably were going to blast me out of the water.

I made my speech, and I don't think that I compromised. I was pretty forthright. When I got through, much to my surprise, they began shooting questions at me. Their condemnation of the company was terrible. I was shocked. I considered myself a conservative alongside of some of these executives. These were middle-management people, who were in the process of being promoted to top management. They were a radical lot, talking all about how bad bigness is; how it doesn't give the individual any opportunity to grow; how there ought to be more competition; how there is a lot of bureaucracy; how a large corporation like theirs is bound to become political; and how, eventually, the corporation winds up behind the eight-ball because of the fact that it has become too big. This is the way they talked. When I got through, I sort of staggered into the office of the man who was running this program and said: "What gives?" He replied, "Our biggest problem here is that about two-thirds of the people who come into this program are anti-company. They have antagonistic attitudes toward the company, and the purpose of our program is to make them loyal to our company. Our problem is how to do it. If we try to squelch them, then they'll become even worse. So, we let them sound off. We hope that, as a result of discussion about the policies and the problems of the company, they will come to identify with it." You can see my point? If you set out with a deliberate intent to try to mold a man into an image that you have of him as a puppet of the company, you are playing with a very dangerous set of factors in our American environment.

Perhaps, I'm not emphasizing the thing that I ought to emphasize. I'm emphasizing the pathological, that is, the extreme forms of this problem. What I want to emphasize is the necessity of getting teamwork and dedication by adopting sound policies and developing a series of human relationships which cause people to be identified with the "mission" of the organization instead of being simply a routine worker who thinks only of the time clock and how much money he draws. This is, perhaps, the most important aspect of leadership, and, therefore, the most important aspect of public relations. Rephrased, the most important aspect of leadership is: What kind of atmosphere is created by the organization?

What is the reflection of the attitudes of its employees toward their work? How do you accomplish that? Do you let nature take its course or do you do something positive to try to get people into a frame of mind so that the public will be influenced?

To give another illustration, one of AT&T's policies, influenced by Arthur Page, is that the local manager is responsible for everything that the telephone company does. The reason for this policy is that they wanted the local manager to become the symbol of the company. One of his responsibilities as the local manager -- and this policy hasn't been changed -- is to make every employee of the telephone company also a symbol. You are supposed to like the man who comes and hitches up your telephone. He is supposed to be courteous; he is supposed to be a civic leader; he is supposed to belong to the Rotary Club and the Lions Club; he is supposed to be a person that you immediately like, because he represents the company. The thinking here is that your attitude toward the company is influenced more by the fact that you know John Jones, and you like him, than it is by the fact that AT&T has 20 billion dollars worth of investment, has over a million and a half stockholders, has 800,000 employees, operates in twenty companies covering the entire United States, and owns Western Electric, which has the major share of the work of producing the telephone equipment. This doesn't influence you as much, does it? It might even influence you adversely because you say it's too big; but, the human element does influence you. The reason I dwell on this so much is because this comes very close to being the essence of the new approach to public relations. Public Relations is policies and people who are inspired by policies, who, therefore, become favorably positive symbols in terms of representing the company. The underlying thinking here is that the best public relations, in the long run, is the kind that builds up gradually areas of goodwill.

If you have executives who are dedicated and satisfied and employees, including labor unions, that are satisfied, and each employee has a circle of friends, then the image of the company is developed by what the employee says. This approach constantly widens out so that, over a period of time, there is a chain reaction: The executive, the sub-executive, the labor member, each with his circle of friends and the circle of friends of each one of his friends, so that eventually -- and here we get into another controversial area -- the goodwill of the company is such that it is virtually impervious to successful attack. This is an objective. The way it is rationalized is by saying that there are always certain people who are going to attack you, for example, the people who want socialism, the labor leaders who want to reap most of the benefits of the company, the competitors who are trying to take the business away from the company. The idea is to create so much goodwill over a period of time that people will come to the support of the enterprise. This also justifies, to a very considerable extent, the desire to increase the number of stockholders. Again using AT&T as an example, if they have a million-and-a-half stockholders now, they might conceivably in time try to have three or four million

stockholders. The idea is that if they have that many, they would have enough influence to successfully prevent any demagogue from trying to make AT&T publicly owned. Remember, it is the only large telephone company in the world that isn't publicly owned.

Role of Board of Directors

The next subject that I want to deal with is the question of the role of the board of directors. Wayne Vasey said that a board of directors ought to represent the public broadly. They ought to be public representatives, rather than representatives of any interest, or any skill group, and that, if they were not broadly representative of the public, a series of dangers would arise. One danger is that the expert would try to interfere in areas where the paid executive ought to decide. The greatest danger is that they might fail to concentrate upon the interconnection of overall policy and might segment policy so that the man who was expert in finance would deal only with finance, and the man who was expert in juvenile delinquency would deal only with juvenile delinquency, or with the blind, or whatever his specialization was. This is a very convincing argument. I don't know that I can accept it completely, because it is certainly unusual, and the reverse is usually the case. Therefore, let me turn devil's advocate and make the contention for the reverse policy on this. I'm going to have a board that is chosen in order to serve certain key purposes that I need -- in terms of survival. I'm going to get a man on my board who has very good business judgment, so that my treasurer will check with him about investments and things of that kind. I will get another member on my board who has a link with organized labor, because organized labor in my particular business is one of the big problems. I'm going to get somebody who is favorably looked upon by labor, the idea being that if I can win this man over as a board member, then he will win over organized labor in any question that is important.

For example, I raise money. I operate a voluntary agency. The AFL and CIO have a lot of money. I'm going to get a key man on my board who has labor contacts, because this is going to help me with my fund raising and my public relations. I'm going to get another man on my board who represents my clientele. I'm in the shipping business. I'm going to get the big name in shipping, one reason being that everybody will say that he is the outstanding man in shipping today. Therefore, if he will take the time to be on the board of this voluntary agency, it must be a pretty good outfit. In addition to this there have been times in the past when our agency has had to go out and raise two million dollars in six months time from the shipping industry. If this leader is on my board, and his company makes a big contribution, then everybody else will follow the leader. As a matter of fact, he will determine the quotas for all the other companies in his field of endeavor, and he will

write a letter to the other companies and say, "Our company has given a hundred thousand dollars. Your share is fifty thousand dollars." I don't have to pay for a lot of staff to raise money. I don't have to spend a lot of money carrying on public relations. This board member is going to raise my two million dollars.

If I am in a welfare agency and I don't have a social worker on my board, then I am finished. This is a very restricted group, you see. They won't do business with anybody who doesn't affiliate with them. Therefore, I'm going to get at least one outstanding social worker on my board so that, if other social workers have any question about whether I am using orthodox methods, my social worker can stand up and say, "I think this is a pretty good outfit. I think they're legitimate."

What I've done about developing a board is pretty hardboiled. The result is that I have a lot of representatives of special interests, and I've picked them for a very deliberate purpose, that is, to get people to behave the way I want them to behave in case any question arises. Now, -- I've created a problem for myself, haven't I? Although I've solved some problems, I've got to get these people to work together. I've got a business and a labor leader. They're always fighting. I've got a social worker, and I know that the labor leader is always unsympathetic to social workers, because he has a welfare program of his own that he wants to run with his own union members. This arrangement can lead to a whole series of internal conflicts. So, I ask myself, "Are you really as smart as you think you are? Wouldn't it have been better to have gotten somebody who just has a name and who has no identification with this particular interest?" Well, this is Dean Vasey's position. My position is that I've created a job for myself, but I've done this deliberately. Therefore, my job is to get these people to work together. I get them to work together by rising above their vocational identification, to concentrate upon a new configuration that tends to unite their interests. This happens to be the welfare of merchant seamen. What reason do I have to think that I can do this? The businessman would help to solve his labor relations problems if he had a reputation for being a friend of the seaman. The labor leader, obviously, has to be a friend of the seamen, because they have the largest union. The banker would say, "If I have a reputation for being connected with a labor movement of this kind and a welfare organization of this kind, it is not going to hurt my Trust Company. As a matter of fact, it's good public relations for my Trust Company." The social worker is going to say, "Here is an organization that is unusual, because at one time it had \$2,000,000 and was very much embarrassed because it had so much money. Therefore, in terms of trying to find out how social agencies can support themselves, maybe there is something to be learned from this maverick!"

I talk to my board members just like this. Over a period of time, if I run a businesslike operation, which is successful, I find that they become more and more interested. One of the interesting things about

people is that the areas of interest with which they get tied up early in life are those with which they usually stick all during life. There is a natural inclination for people to become interested and to identify. The longer they stay with it, the harder it is to break away. Therefore, if I could get this motley crew who have various jobs to serve on my board of directors, to carry out their appointed roles, and if I have enough confidence in myself, I believe that I can weld them together as a cohesive group over a period of time. All right, now the devil's advocate is through.

Relationship With Other Groups

The next thing that the executive has to think about is his relationship with other groups. This is my last point, because after it Wayne Vasey is going to take over. In many ways, relationships with other groups is the most difficult part of public relations. I want to suggest what some of the issues are in terms of the operating official. Remember, I am still being the hard-boiled official, or as hard-boiled as I am capable of becoming. In almost every agency there is some competition. Competition is a very great asset in terms of developing the attitude on the part of the organization that the executive is interested in developing. Hence, one of the great temptations the executive has is to accentuate competition to the point that it becomes a positive social evil. Have you ever heard of the Iron Law of Oligarchy? I am sure you have. The Iron Law of Oligarchy is that the people who run the organizations tend, by various devices, to appeal to their followers in such a way that they become indispensable. The people become attached not only to the program but to the Oligarchs themselves. You can all think of illustrations of this. It is one reason that labor leaders -- and this is particularly true in the past, -- it isn't as true today -- are constantly talking tough and talking about the enemy, which is business. It is the reason the military talks as it does. It tends to make the followers overlook the imperfections of the individual and of the organization and to rally around because of the "we group" against the "they group". Every organization does this, some more blatantly than others. Thus, one of the controversial issues in public relations is: To what extent can competition be used as a morale builder? To what extent can it be used before it becomes dangerous? There are very many dangers. Let me point to some of them: A lot of senseless overlapping; a lot of waste of public funds; a lot of waste of precious personnel; the possibility that your clients don't get as good a service because of this overlapping and wasteful use of resources as they would if they were in a more rational organization; a tendency to expand, simply because the American ethos says that growth is represented by expansion into new areas. Therefore, you go into areas that are directly competitive with those of agencies that are concerned with

the same general field, because, according to the American idea of growth, you ought to go into new areas, even if it involves duplication.

There are certain other temptations. One temptation is that the larger your organization, the bigger its budget; the bigger its budget, the higher your salary; the bigger the budget, the more of an administrative challenge; the bigger the budget, the more prestige you get. All of this is very easily rationalized by saying, "But I am doing all of this simply for the good of my clientele." That's the easiest rationalization of all. This is the other side of competition. My belief is, if I may moralize for a moment, that the best way to prevent this is to be honest with yourself and to realize that, often, the competitive element is like old-fashioned public relations. If it burns you, it's bad; it's a mistake.

This becomes important because of the fact that there is a tendency on the part of all organizations and all leadership to look for areas of growth. It's not merely the largest organizations like General Electric and AT&T. As a matter of fact, I predict that within a short time, they will be concentrating upon becoming smaller. I really believe that, without the government forcing them to do it, they will become smaller. There is a universal tendency for all organizations to become larger. Since this is inherent, the competitive element is one that we ought constantly to keep in mind in terms of our executive responsibilities.

Community Relations

Dean Wayne Vasey

In a way, we have gone full circle on our subject presentation. We started off with community-based objectives and are now at the point of discussing some of the more specific features of community organization in relation to agencies serving this particular clientele.

Every once in a while a community undergoes what I call a convulsive reaction to its welfare enterprises. This is a time when the people who are in positions of leadership are inclined to question whether there might be a lot of overlapping and duplication of services. (Remember that Marshall Dimock said that this kind of "inefficiency" might not necessarily be bad since in the American scheme of things we tend to like to venture; therefore, we ought to put up with some ostensible inefficiencies.) A convulsive point of action is especially likely to come about, when the United Fund drive or the Community Chest bogs down. People begin to look for a scapegoat. This is another one of our national characteristics, that is, searching for some single, simple explanation that can be dealt with. Dennis W. Brogan, a British writer specializing in the American scene, had an article in Harpers Magazine a few years ago, called, "The Illusion of American Omnipotence," (1) in which he said that we have the idea that we can control or manage or overcome anything. We think we have this ability because of our "gogetterism," our enterprising, and our daring. When something goes wrong, like China falling to the Reds, the only explanation we can accept is the possible one that somebody erred or some single thing went wrong that could be remedied. In this case, of course, it was the Communist in the State Department, or a few other simple explanations, if you will recall.

In a discussion with Mr. Brogan a few months ago, I mentioned this article to him and asked if this same observation would pertain to domestic affairs. He replied, "Yes." And I queried, "To a welfare program which was going badly?" He again replied affirmatively and went on to say, "You would immediately search for a single, simple explanation like overlapping and duplication or elimination of waste. You can't accept the possibility that there can be a series of inter-related conflicts and causes, leading to this unfortunate consequence."

Some time ago, in New Jersey, I met a group of businessmen who were all flared up because the United Fund Drive was bogged down. One of the agencies, which was a favorite of many people, was about to pull out of the United Fund. These gentlemen were going to get at the problem of duplication and waste by a study -- Studies are good things sometimes and this was going to be a high powered study. In six months they were

going to have the answer -- with complete use of electronic equipment, of course. Some of us tried very patiently and earnestly to point out that you didn't solve many intricate problems in six months. There are a number of value questions involved in the associations with these agencies and the number of needs that are served. You couldn't go in just on the basis of a superficial kind of efficiency and solve these problems in six months. Well, they did a very good survey. They hired one of the survey firms in social welfare, who came out with what I think is an excellent report. But it would seem that this approach is beginning to be a kind of fad -- the fad of eliminating waste, duplication and overlapping, and then going on to develop an orderly organization of community service with each agency deployed to do that which it is best equipped, by purpose and by resources, to do. It requires other agencies to subordinate their part in such an enterprise to the one that is best equipped. I say this is a fad, because, again, it is an oversimplification to a very complex problem. This kind of an approach may be a threat to venturesomeness, to development of new ideas, to development of new forms of expression of service. It can go too far.

We do know that a lot of dispersed, excessively small agencies doing the same thing can be bad. We also know that, in our present society, with its complexities, its interdependence and its dominant urban character, choices may have to be made to subordinate what the agency wants to do to community needs, i.e., to those priority needs that we mentioned the first day. Some adaptations of this kind are required to bring about an adjustment of community needs and priorities. I don't think the answer lies in a wholesale clean-sweeping or in developing a neat organization in which neatness itself is the objective. It puts, however, on the agencies the responsibility to act responsibly, to achieve effective communication with other agencies and to see that people do not fall in the interstices between agencies.

I tell students in a class in social welfare organization that an agency has a purpose expressed in a program or mission. People come because they think that program is going to meet a need, that it will help them cope with a problem they have. When the person gets to the agency, he may find that this is not the agency to which he should have been sent or which he should have sought. But no one ought to leave any kind of welfare agency without some kind of a formulation of approach to his problem. It may not be more than an interview to help him go to the place where he can get the help. I think that some of our agencies in urban centers, in a search for sophistication, may have forgotten some of this.

I want to say that this spirit of helpfulness has to permeate the agency. Once, in an oral examination, I asked an aspiring candidate for a County Welfare Director's post what he thought should be the attributes of a receptionist. He gave what I think was a very good answer. She

should have the tolerance and understanding of a saint, the warmth or manner of an airline hostess, and the general construction and appearance of a night club hostess. I mention the point of the receptionist because this is the point at which the person meets the agency. I think the important thing is this concept of helpfulness. That is, welfare agencies are helping-agencies. True, they are specialized as to function, in varying degrees, but they still are basically helping-enterprises. Their whole posture should be one of readiness to help, even though that help may be of a most transitory kind, like getting a person to the right spot. This may seem so simple and obvious as not to require elaboration. But do you think we sometimes forget this? We know that in every community there are interstices. As we get more and more specialization of function in our society, there is always the danger that someone might not quite fit the proper classification of problem which demands specialized service. We get categorical approaches because we have to have categorization of services. But we want to be careful that we don't get what Raymond Male, the Commissioner of Labor and Industry in New Jersey, calls "hardening of the categories."

These are important considerations. How are we going to reconcile our objectives of an efficient organization of community service and still avoid a stultifying, compulsory organization which denies the out-thrust of new venture? That's a nice problem, and it involves the agency and the board. Dr. Dimock very correctly pointed out the over-reaction to the fear of specialization. I think that there is the danger that the specialist on the board will behave as we pointed out. I think the answer lies in how the board is handled or in the gestalt or configuration of the board. The board is extremely important in setting the agency's goals and the program. The board is also community-related and must be utilized in making this accommodation to community needs while still maintaining its individuality of purpose and program.

Agencies for the blind have a particular responsibility in this regard, because you have a designated clientele, a clientele based on loss of sight. Each of you represents an agency which has as part of its objective one of the functions we mentioned the other day, namely, to act as a spokesman or representative for this particular clientele or group. Therefore, appropriate referral has implications in terms of your responsibility for the person.

On the one hand, you desire to protect this group because they are your particular responsibility. The perception of your role is not only that of a spokesman but that of a protector. Against that, you have the desire not to be so protective that you deny them access to the whole community.

Earlier in discussion one of you made the statement, "If you cannot give a service, you get it." This is a traditional social work concept

and one which we have lost in part at least, but it is not too much in our past, and we hope that we are reviving it. However, there is still something you have to build on from that. Getting the service is still not enough. I have made a statement in one of my writings that the truths which are imbedded in the familiar complexities of everyday experiences are the hardest to identify and to use. We have lots of facts at our command, but we need to use them in community planning, and we need to use them diagnostically. If we find gaps in services, if we find needs that are not being met, if we find needs which are being met badly, if we find programs that need improvement or need initiation, we could do something about them if we would use what we observe in our daily experience. If we would continually take action on the basis of factual knowledge gained from daily experience I think that we would be much more effective in relation to the group we are serving. The dichotomy between planning and doing is all too sharply drawn. The two elements are not that distinct. The best kind of planning derives from experience, but the experience can be met with myopic vision unless there is a continuing and conscious effort to infer broader truths from it. This is one of the most important responsibilities of specialized agencies in relation to their clientele, namely, to translate the need into a service somewhere in the community. It doesn't mean that you should become the all-encompassing or the omnibus agency. You can't be that in either a rural or an urban community. Sometimes you also have to accept the realities of human experience and realize that there are times when nothing can be done, at least for the moment. But you at least know the problem, and you know why it cannot be handled now. This is an important agency and executive responsibility. It gives an extra dimension to everybody's work in the organization. It's not just a job for the specialist. Community organization in this sense is everybody's job.

There is another dimension to community organization which I think should be noted. Community planning is more than just planning for a group or a clientele or in relation to a need. There was a time in our "laissez-faire" economy, I suppose, when a person with a social or physical handicap could have his problem solved by an agency which wasn't necessarily an integral part of community life. But our growing interdependence and our community growth, accompanied by urbanization; plus the fact that the paycheck is most people's only basis for economic security have led to a universalization or broadening of concern, in a sense, for all agencies. More and more, agencies have to be a part of total community planning.

When physical planners and welfare planners are side by side in the same community and never relate to each other, you have, I think, a serious situation. This dimension of planning also pertains to rural areas as well. Rural areas don't have quite as distinct an institutional frame for services, but they still have the problem and the need. This dimension of planning is something to which we are going to have to pay increasing attention.

For one thing, gaps in welfare services or serious lacks of services in a community are indicative of more than a welfare problem. They may be diagnostic devices for the determination of certain pathologies in community life itself. If there is a concentration of problems in a certain area, it's a rather important diagnostic tool. At least, it helps you to locate a problem. A high incidence of problem, a high incidence of dependency, or a large amount of neglect, may indicate that a change has taken place in community attitude; the community itself may need help.

There are considerations that make me think that we need to apply this dimension to our welfare and rehabilitation planning activities. In a recent study done by a vocational rehabilitation counselor in the town of New Brunswick, he worked with not only employment agencies but employers. He found that there was a serious problem in relation to use of the handicapped people. Attitudes indicated a very bad employment prospect for them. He also found some indices of change in the economic fortunes of that community which have since proved to be prophetic. I think that this is important. Another thing that I believe is important is our concept of community organization. Community organization is a much more vital activity than merely keeping order; its more than just a neat job of housekeeping among agencies. Community organization is a dynamic process. I wonder if we don't have some indicators of this in the community development programs in under-developed countries. Note that they describe their initiation of a whole new kind of service as community development, not community organization, and they don't very often call on people who are in community organization in this country to use their particular skills to participate in community development programs. They are constantly saying, "You have much to teach us. You have a process which could be useful to us, but we are not asking you to do the job because you also have certain defects in your approach. You are too institutionally bound by certain practices and processes. You have too much difficulty in making adaptations as they are needed. You have to work with plentiful resources."

As I visited some of the underdeveloped countries, there were some features which were quite similar to those that characterize rural areas in which I had worked in the Midwest and in Colorado, especially in the Dust Bowl. I found some of the same lacks and gaps in both -- gaps that must be filled in order to develop even the most fundamental services. Therefore, I am suggesting that this is another aspect of community organization; that is, we need to be able to adapt our processes to changing community needs and situations.

The Challenge of Being an Administrator

Dr. Marshall Dimock

It seems to me that the theme of this conference might have been "The Challenge of Being an Administrator." The position of the administrator is a little bit like the blind person. One of the problems of the blind person, I imagine, is that his horizon tends to close in upon him. He needs constantly to fight to broaden it again. By the same token, the administrator, because of the nature of his work, tends to be, at the very least, myopic. There's a very good reason for this. The administrator needs to be practical. He needs to be at his desk many hours of the day. He needs to pay attention to detail. There's a great deal that he has to do himself, even in large agencies. He needs to be on the ball. Being an administrator is an ulcerous kind of a job, and don't let anybody tell you that it is not. Under these circumstances, the administrator constantly has to fight to enlarge his horizon. The question arises, "Why does he need to do this?" I want to make this the theme that runs throughout my summary.

The administrator is a person, who, at any level of organization, has responsibility for planning, policy, decision making, and supervision. Therefore, there are various grades of the administrator. It's not merely the top administrator. The word "executive" is very similar to the word "administrator", except that when we usually talk about the executive we mean the top executive. Even that is not invariable.

These persons, i.e., administrators, have a very great complexity to deal with. To the extent that they are able to deal with complexity and to fit together many complex things smoothly and effectively in terms of accomplishing social needs, executives are successful or unsuccessful. The best test of an executive is whether he is able to integrate things so well that it becomes almost unconscious. That's why I referred the other day to executive work being a form of artistry, which I believe very strongly it is. This idea has been expressed by quite a few people. Let me mention some of them.

Various studies have been made by psychologists as to what constitutes the acid test of the executive's ability. They all point to the conclusion that conceptualization is perhaps the principal ingredient. By conceptualization, we mean the ability to analyze a number of complicated factors and to go to the heart of the problem in such a way as not only to understand them but to do something about them.

Thurston () showed, for example, that one of the tests of a good executive is "word ability", words or concepts and their relations and the ideas they connote. Another test has shown that rapid reading ability and getting ideas out of complicated memorandum is a test of executive ability. This points to the same thing. Executive ability is penetration of complexity and the understanding of relationships.

Chester Barnard has pointed out, in The Functions of the Executive,⁽¹³⁾ that in the higher ranges of executive work, decision-making becomes intuitional. Intuition is based upon long experience as a result of which a person has learned about cause and effect of relationships, so that instead of seeking consecutively A, B, C, & D, he knows them on the basis of past experience. We call this intuition, that is, the right thing to do under the circumstances. In other words, we would have to stop and analyze all of the factors, if we didn't have cumulative experience. If we didn't develop this intuitive artistry, the chances are that we would get almost nothing done.

There is another aspect of this problem. It is that, increasingly, the most important problem in executive work is exercising good judgment. Good judgment is, I am sure, a matter of more than this conceptualization, this analytical ability and this intuition. It also includes values and a sense of aesthetics. Certainly, in all of our organizations, even though they may be very small, the development of judgment is a very important factor. You are not likely to develop judgment if you remain too narrow. Now, I do not mean that you ought to set out to become a person who is shallow and who knows a little bit about everything but nothing about your field. I think this is a real obstacle in our thinking. I want to explain what I think it does mean. It means that we have to have an awareness of all the factors, a sensitivity to all the factors, a sort of an intuitive appreciation of all the factors, in terms of reaching the right judgment and, thereby, doing the right thing with and for people. The chances are that even our personalities are shaped by these things. If you become stolid and sullen, for example, the chances are that you have a limited number of admirers. If you have more stimulation, a greater sensitivity and a greater sense of awareness, it probably affects your personality, which, in turn, affects your work, all of which indicates that there is a very great challenge in doing executive work.

One of the most interesting thoughts in this whole area is expressed in the book by Thorston Veblen on The Instinct of Workmanship⁽¹⁵⁾ and by John Hobson in his book, Workmanship.⁽¹⁶⁾ To them, being an executive is largely a matter of developing an instinct for professional work, which is satisfying in terms of responding to all of the challenges that we've dealt with. It is in this larger context that executive work takes on meaning. Not only does executive work tend to "cabin" and

confine the individual, but even within the realm of managerial thinking there is a tendency for this segmentation. Thus, for example, various segments have been emphasized in the past on the assumption that this is the whole of the problem. Gradually, we are beginning to realize that no one segment of administration can be emphasized in neglect of others. Some of the areas that apparently are going to become important in the near future are planning, group leadership, delegation, coordination, motivation, an understanding of what the dangers are in bureaucracy, and what leads to administrative vitality. We need bi-focal vision. We need to be experts in our subject matter, and we need to be experts in administration. Insofar as we can fuse these two lenses we become better administrators.

We need delegation by plan instead of by whim. We need the idea of the configuration to which Mary Parker Follett called attention. We need to realize that there are three ways of securing agreement. Domination is one; compromise is another. Neither one is satisfactory. The most important one is integration.

We need to learn more about how policy is communicated. Another area to which we need to respond to the challenge of becoming better administrators is the area of practical, day-to-day administration. If we can get an awareness of all of the factors that are involved, if we can constantly broaden ourselves as a result of our experiences and our reading, we will then become better administrators. We will become better administrators, not because we have become shallow and superficial and talk glibly about a large number of subjects, but because we have a wider horizon, a wider sense of awareness, and greater sensitivity to all of the factors, including the economic, the political, and all of the other institutions in life which influence our work.

The second large area in which this sense of relationship is important is in the field of policy. The best approach to policy is to start with an analysis of the problem. This takes that analytical ability which is the hallmark of the administrator. We also need a value system. We need to combine this with an ability to act, because one of the principal weaknesses in individuals is that some people have very good ideas but have little ability to carry them out. Some people have ability to carry out ideas but have very few ideas. We need to be able to do both. We need to develop policy, and we need to communicate it. Part of this is done by rules and regulations, but very largely it is done by leadership, example, direction, supervision, encouragement, and the use of incentives. In these processes we need to make decisions.

Policy is a changing and dynamic field because of social forces which in turn constantly change the mission which you and I have. One of the ways that we are able to make these adjustments is by the development of temperamental traits. Policy can either be a barrier or an avenue to accomplishment. Therefore, one of the things that the executive

needs to know is when and when not to make policies. We need to recognize that there is a constantly changing clientele. We need to realize that the most important thing as far as dealing with blind persons is concerned, is that we need to perform our administrative tasks in such a way that the level of aspiration constantly arises in terms of the concrete results that we produce. We need to realize that people respond as they are treated. Therefore, we need a deep belief in people being served, because this is the spirit which ought to infuse everything we do. There is a tendency towards specialization even in small services. We ought to be careful not to carry this to an extreme.

Periodically, we need to reexamine and redefine our services. We need to develop our roles consciously. We need to give priority to the various phases of the work that we undertake. We need to realize that efficiency in and of itself is not enough unless we define efficiency in a broader way than most people do. There are several ways in which you can define your role. It is not merely a matter of becoming simply adjusted; it is not merely a matter of being comfortable; it is also a matter of bringing a person to the level of the highest and most productive plane that he can achieve. This applies to the administrator and to those working with us, as well as to our clients. Therefore, the objective, for ourselves as administrators, for the people who work with us, and for our clients should be the provision of opportunity commensurate with the abilities of the people involved.

One of the ways to bring about this sensitivity is by emphasizing public relations. Public relations is not something which is a separable part of administration; it is the whole of administration. Public relations is policy and people, and the image that is created by the contacts in the community. Therefore, the question of media, although important, is really subordinated to the overall objectives of the program.

We need, increasingly, to realize that one of the ways of bringing about a wider conception of our role is not by trying to take on more and more work, which perhaps others can do better, but by having a clear awareness of how our work fits in with the work of other agencies. This is the universal principle. An employee is a better employee and a more highly motivated employee if he has a sense of relationship of his work to the work as a whole. By the same token, any agency dealing with the blind is likely to be more highly motivated and more intelligent in its decisions if it has a vivid awareness of how it fits into a larger pattern.

One of the ways of accomplishing this result is by more frequent conferences. We ought to have enough confidence in each other to realize that we can confer with each other without being threatened in any way, without having somebody aggrandize himself at our expense. Insofar as

we get this cooperative relationship, we are finding the substitute for authoritarianism. Hence, the final challenge of being an administrator is that if we are able to do all of these things we will be contributing significantly to the perpetuation of our way of life, because our way of life is based upon the idea that the individual is the goal of life, but the individual has opportunity and ability only through institutions.

We are the people who run the institutions. Therefore, we need to reconcile what seems to be a conflict between the individualized approach and the collective approach. The way that we reconcile this is through voluntary cooperative effort. That means, if we are not to have regimentation and planning imposed by an authoritative government, that we have a responsibility for doing that planning ourselves as free independent individuals. If we are able to broaden ourselves as administrators, we will be much better able to accomplish these goals.

FOOTNOTES

1. Handel, Alexander F. Community Attitudes -- A Factor in Psycho-social Adjustment to Disability. The New Outlook for the Blind, Vol. 54, No. 10, December 1961.
2. American Foundation for the Blind. Survey report of the Buffalo Association for the Blind. New York, American Foundation for the Blind, Division of Community Services, April 1961. p.4.
3. Leavitt, Harold & Whisler, Thomas, Management of the 1980's. Harvard Business Review, Vol. 36, No. 6, November-December 1958.
4. Learned, Edmund, Ulrich, David & Booz, Donald. Executive Action. Boston Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1957.
5. Finer, Herman. The Presidency; Crisis and Regeneration. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
6. Whyte, William H. The Organization Man. New York, Simon & Schuster, 1956.
7. Milne, A.A. The House at Pooh Corner. New York, E.P. Dutton, 1928. (Chapter V In which Rabbit has a busy day, and we learn what Christopher Robin does in the mornings.)
8. Frost, Robert. Complete Poems. New York, Holt, 1949.
9. McCamy, James L. Government Publicity. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1939.
10. Rosten, Leo. The Washington Correspondents. New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1937.
11. Dimock, Marshall. Public Administration. New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1959. 2nd edition.
12. Dimock, Marshall. Administrative Vitality. New York, Harper, 1959.
13. Barnard, Chester. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1938.
14. Brogan, Dennis W. The Illusion of American Omnipotence. Harper's Magazine, December 1952.
15. Veblen, Thorstein. The Instinct of Workmanship. New York, B. W. Huebsch, 1922.
16. Hobson, John. Work and Wealth. New York, Macmillan, 1914.
17. Laski, Harold. The Limitations of the Expert. In Anderson, Sylvia F. ed. Our Changing World. New York, Harpers, 1939. pp. 234-251

Institute
On
Administrative Problems of Executives of Agencies for the Blind
Arden House, Harriman, New York, May 1, 2, 3, 1961
Sponsored by the
New York State Commission for the Blind
In Cooperation with the
American Foundation for the Blind
With a Grant From the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation

Discussion Outline

I. Program Development for Client Services

- a. The existence of a problem
- b. Nature of the problem
- c. Community appeal and pressure for action
- d. Timeliness of problem

Comments:

Social welfare programs, whether under governmental or voluntary auspices, are directed toward specific problems of a particular clientele. They operate under particular sanctions. These sanctions or authorizations establish limits as well as range. However, they are never so specific as to predetermine in detail all of the action of the agency charged with responsibility for administering the program, or to anticipate all decisions which must be made. The agency must determine its "mission" in relation to the law or charter or other organic policy under which it operates. Most if not all such expressions of policy leave room for either broad or narrow interpretations of the mission.

Questions:

1. Shall the program be one of humane support without emphasis on rehabilitation, or shall it offer rehabilitation services?
2. How broadly?
3. What needs or problems of the clientele shall be given priority?
4. What considerations shall govern the choice of services?
5. How shall needs and problems, and services related to them be evaluated?
6. How is the danger of program obsolescence to be avoided?
7. How may program changes keep pace with changing needs of the clientele?
8. What have been the major developments in services to the blind, governmental and voluntary, in the last quarter century?

9. Where have they fallen short?

II. Integration of Service Programs Within the Agency

Comments:

An organization must be created to administer a program. This organization must have certain characteristics and relationships within it. It must provide for the deployment of skills, for specialization of function, and for a consistent pattern or process. While charged with responsibility for consistency, it must not provide a static administration. It must provide an effective release for the creative energies of staff. It must provide a "vitality" which "combines the qualities of strength, drive, endurance, sensitivity, responsiveness, and adaptability in a synthesis called institutional management." (Dimock, Administrative Vitality, p.5.) Process doesn't just happen. It must be planned.

Questions:

1. What is the responsibility of the executive in such an enterprise?
2. Is his role primarily one of keeping order?
3. Is it chiefly one of providing a smooth operation?
4. Of keeping the motor running and seeing that the gears mesh?
5. Is there a component of leadership in his role?
6. How much freedom of innovation and experimentation does he have?
7. What is the nature of his authority?
8. What is the role of staff?
9. What kinds of authority do members of the staff have vested in their positions in the organization?
10. Who sets the tone of the organization? How?

The Bureaucratic structure (the term is used descriptively, not negatively) presents certain dangers, which may result in attrition of purpose, or loss of vitality. When this happens inefficiency results, and service is the chief casualty.

11. What are these dangers?
12. How may they be avoided?
13. Are they exclusively characteristic of large organizations?
14. Do smaller enterprises also face such dangers?

15. Are they peculiar to governmental programs?

III. Integration of Service Programs Within the Community

Comments:

All communities today are served by a network of agencies, each with its own program, and each at some point meeting similar needs and serving the same clientele as other agencies. Agencies today face a formidable challenge of coordination of effort. Many authorities contend that the community, not the agency itself, should provide the focus for planning, and that the agency, so far as possible, should yield to a system of community priorities. Others hold more strongly to the principle of agency sovereignty, and contend that too much of this would constitute an unwarranted surrender.

Whatever the outcome of this argument, the fact remains that programs for the blind must be related to the services offered in other programs. Isolation is a luxury that the community cannot afford to support. A good job well done is not enough if it is done at the expense of another that is more vital to the community.

The growth of governmental services has posed a new problem (and opportunity) in planning for services to the blind. At best, voluntary and governmental services are complementary rather than competitive. Another problem, at least in some communities, is posed by the developments which are occurring in industry, in population, and in many aspects of physical change. Keeping pace is in itself quite a chore today.

Questions:

1. What do the programs for the blind, voluntary and governmental, reflect in relation to community planning?
2. Are they developing responsively?
3. How active are executives (and boards) of agencies as participants in community planning?
4. To what extent do administrators act as spokesmen for their clientele?
5. To what extent should they?
6. How effectively are the resources of the agency being utilized by the community?

IV. Summary.

Comments:

These are some of the major questions which may be raised in relation

to the mission of the program, the structure and the process of organization and administration, and the place of the program in the community.

They are not easy questions to answer. Neither are they academic. They present concerns which may with profit engage the attention of agency executives. While generic to many kinds of programs, they may be studied with particular reference to programs for the blind. Answers are not pat, or ready made. Some at least may be suggested through the process of group participation in a thorough and frank discussion by people now engaged in these tasks, as they provide a framework for the kinds of decisions which executives must make.

ATTENDEES AT 1961
ARDEN HOUSE INSTITUTE

Mrs. N. E. Aldrich, Executive Secretary
Southwestern Tier Assoc. for the Blind
Jamestown, N.Y.

Mr. Sherman Barr, Executive Director
Vacation Camp for the Blind
New York City

Mr. Herbert Brown, Director
Vocational Rehabilitation Service
N.Y. State Commission for the Blind
Albany, N.Y.

Mrs. Annis Buecking, Executive Secretary
Glens Falls Association for the Blind
Glens Falls, N.Y.

Miss Muriel Burns, Executive Secretary
Jefferson County Assn. for the Blind, Inc.
Watertown, N.Y.

Mr. John Butler, Director
National Personnel Referral Service
American Foundation for the Blind
New York City

Mrs. Stephen Eaton, Executive Secretary
Cattaraugus County Assn. for Aid to the
Blind
Olean, N.Y.

Dr. H. Kenneth Fitzgerald, Regional Rep.
American Foundation for the Blind
New York City

Mrs. Marjorie Frank, Assoc. Administrative
Director
The Jewish Guild for the Blind
New York City

Mrs. Eleanor Franke, Executive Director
Association for the Blind of Rochester
Rochester, N. Y.

Mr. Oscar Friedensohn, Asst. Director
N. Y. State Commission for the Blind
New York City

Rev. Martin Hall, Director
Catholic Guild for the Blind
Diocese of Rockville Centre
Lynbrook, L.I.

Miss Adelaide Hayes, Executive Secretary
Buffalo Association for the Blind
Buffalo, N.Y.

Miss Marion Held, Director
Direct Services
New York Association for the Blind
New York City

Rev. J. Kartarvish, Associate Director
Catholic Guild for the Blind
Diocese of Brooklyn, Inc.
Brooklyn, N.Y.

Miss Elisabeth Maloney, Dir. Social Svs.
Industrial Home for the Blind
Brooklyn, N.Y.

Mrs. W. Michaels, Exec. Vice President
Brooklyn Assn. for Improving the
Condition of the Poor
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Miss Helen McBride, Exec. Secretary
Central Association for the Blind
Utica, N.Y.

Miss Virginia McDonough, Supervising Con-
sultant on Community Services for the
Blind
N.Y. State Commission for the Blind
New York City

Miss M. Anne McGuire, Director
N. Y. State Commission for the Blind
New York City

Miss M. McVeigh, Assoc. Regional Rep.
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation
New York City

Mrs. Grace Nolan, Secretary
Catholic Guild for the Blind
Buffalo, N.Y.

Mr. Harry Spar, Assistant Director
Industrial Home for the Blind
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mr. Jos. Pike, Executive Director
Albany Association of the Blind
Albany, N. Y.

Mr. Jack Spear, Head,
Traveling Libraries
New York State Library for the Blind
Albany, N. Y.

Mrs. Sidney E. Pollack, Administrative Director
The Jewish Guild for the Blind,
New York City

Miss Eleanor Walsh, Associate Director
Bureau of Public Assistance
New York State Dept. of Social Welfare
Albany, N. Y.

Mr. Louis Rives, Jr., Chief
Division Services to the Blind
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation
Washington, D. C.

Mr. Vernon Woolston, Executive Director
Syracuse Association of Workers for the
Blind, Inc.
Syracuse, N. Y.

Mr. Harold Roberts, Director
Bureau of Field Service
American Foundation for the Blind
New York City

Mr. James F. Zinck, Managing Director
Blind Work Association, Inc.
Binghamton, N. Y.

Mr. Julius Rothbein, Business Manager
N. Y. State Commission for the Blind
New York City

Mr. Paul Sauerland, Asst. to the Director
Catholic Guild for the Blind for the
Archdiocese of New York
New York City

Mr. Irving Selis, Executive Director
Associated Blind, Inc.
New York City

Mr. Allen Sherman, Executive Director
New York Association for the Blind
New York City

Mrs. Mary Silk, Community Services Consultant
N. Y. State Commission for the Blind
Buffalo, N.Y.

Mr. Robert Slawson, Consultant on Community
Planning
American Foundation for the Blind
New York City

Miss Evelyn Smith, Asst. Director
Vocational Rehabilitation Services
New York State Commission for the Blind
Albany, N. Y.

HV1775

c. 1

F

Fitzgerald, H. Kenneth, ed.
Proceedings of Arden House
Institute on administrative
problems of executives of agencies
for the blind.

Date Due

HV1775

c. 1

F Fitzgerald, H. Kenneth

AUTHOR

Proceedings of Arden House

TITLE

Institute on administrative
problems of executives of

DATE
LOANED

agencies for the blind,

DATE
LOANED

Reference Copy

